THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 19 | May, 1937 | Number 5

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

May Day & the New Advance
R. P. DUTT

Arms & the Labour Party
E. SHINWELL, M.P.

The Monarchy Fetish
T. A. JACKSON

'Left' Socialism & the I.L.P.
J. R. CAMPBELL

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE
LABOUR MONTHLY

Vol. 19 March, 1937 No. 3

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Unity or War R.P.D.

Unity and the People's Front
Professor Laski, Harry Adams, G.D.H. Cole.

War Loans, Rearmament and Labour Policy A. F. Papworth

Hitler and Europe Robert Dell

Spain and the People's Front U.H.P.

The Trotskyist Trial R. Page Arnot

Book Reviews

THE
LABOUR MONTHLY

Vol. 19 April, 1937 No. 4

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

The Arms Plan R.P.D.

The Labour Party and the Arms Stampede D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P.

Next Steps for a United Front J. R. Campbell

Towards the First of May John A. Mahon

The Indian Elections Ben Bradley

James Connolly: Some Reminiscences Tom Bell

Selected Letters V. I. Lenin

Book Reviews

HE HAS HIS NEW READER . . .

HAVE YOU?

THE
DAILY WORKER

must double its circulation. A mass circulation is a vital necessity in the struggle for unity.

Order now. 7d. per week from *The Daily Worker*, Nelson Place, Cayton St., London, E.C.1 and from numerous newsagents everywhere

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 19 MAY, 1937 NUMBER 5

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month - - - - - Page 267
THE NEW ADVANCE
By R. P. D.

Rearmament and the Labour Party - - - ,, 277
By E. SHINWELL, M.P.

The Monarchy Fetish - - - - - ,, 283
By T. A. JACKSON

Spain: The Record of Transport House - - ,, 287
By "U.H.P."

Civil Liberty - - - - - - - - ,, 296
By G. H. C. BING

"Left" Socialism and the People's Front - ,, 302
By J. R. CAMPBELL

Fascism in South Africa - - - - - ,, 313
By REGINALD BRIDGEMAN

Book Reviews - - - - - - ,, 317
Facing the Facts - - - - - *By* Allen Hutt
Durham Miners - - - - - *By* W. Allan
Art and Society - - - - - *By* F. D. Klingender
Heroism Victorious - - - - *By* Julius Jacobs
Eugene Pottier et "l'Internationale" - - *By* William Zak

Students' Fund - - - - - - ,, 327

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1937 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 2800 Bronx Park East, New York City, U.S.A.

South African Representative :—The People's Bookshop, 30 Kirk Street, Johannesburg, South Africa.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 49 Farringdon Road, E.C.1.

Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per page (ordinary position) and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 5s. od.	*Volume X*	£1 10s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	£1 1s. od.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XII*	15s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XIII*	15s. 6d.
Volume V	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XVI*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XVII*	10s. 6d.
Volume IX	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XVIII*	10s. 6d.

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue except for 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

May Day and the New Working-Class Advance—Responsibilities of Leadership—Consequences of the Arms Plan—Towards New Economic Struggles—Economic Situation—The Dance of Profits—Fall of Real Wages—Forty-Hour Week—French and American Contrasts—New Problems of Trade Unionism—Constructive Programme Needed—Government's Arms Plan Offensive—Menace to Trade Unionism—Danger Signals—Lessons of Events—Preparing for Action

MAY Day, 1937, is witnessing a new upward wave of the working-class movement throughout the world. The military victories of Spanish Democracy are in the vanguard of this advance, and have given renewed confidence to the fight against fascism in every country. In France and the United States the workers have won sweeping gains in the industrial field and in strengthened organisation. The Paris workers' general strike beat back the attempt of French fascism to raise its head anew, and strengthened the weakening Blum Government. In Belgium the electoral defeat of Degrelle was of European significance as an expression of the gathering forces against fascism. In India the overwhelming electoral victory of the National Congress and the initial breakdown of the imposed Constitution herald big struggles in front. Finally, in Britain, although we are still at an earlier stage of advance, the success of the Unity Campaign, the turning of the electoral tide to new Labour gains in the London and other local elections, and the beginnings of a new strike movement indicate a rising spirit of militancy which all the drums of Coronation jingoism and arms profiteering orgies cannot conceal.

THIS situation throws big responsibilities on the leadership of the working-class movement. *The urgent problem now is to organise the new united movement of advance for which the workers are ready—on such a scale and with such speed as to thrust back the burdens of the arms race from the shoulders of the workers on to the shoulders of the rich, to win permanent gains in the economic field, to prepare in this*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way advance on the political field, and on the basis of this advance to outstrip and defeat the rising menace of war and reaction, expressed in the arms race. We should be fools to be blind to the urgency of the situation, or to view with complacency the present moment as simply a favourable cyclical turn, offering the opportunity to win back some of the ground lost by trade unionism during the depression. The decisive immediate field of advance is now the economic field ; this is the next link in the chain. But this possibility of economic advance is taking place under peculiar conditions—the conditions of the Arms Plan.

THE Arms Plan dominates both the political and the economic situation. The workers are beginning to advance. But at the same time the war forces are advancing. It is a race between the two. The very conditions of the Arms Plan, the intensified speed-up, the increased employment, the rising prices, the heavier burdens, which are impelling the workers to new struggles, are at the same time creating peculiar new conditions of the struggle, through the moves of the National Government and the trade union leadership to co-operation over the Arms Plan, and the consequent preparation of a new intensified offensive against the working-class movement. This is the special character of the present situation. *It is for the problems consequent on this situation, problems comparable in certain respects with those of the war-time period of* 1914-1918, *that trade unionists now need to prepare.*

FOR the Arms Plan means two parallel processes in the social and economic sphere. On the one side it creates conditions, or intensifies the already existing conditions, which are driving the workers to the inescapable necessity of new struggles. It means a bacchanalia of profiteering, which is already in full swing (and which will not be in the slightest affected by Neville Chamberlain's ghostly simulacrum of an excess profits tax, to reach a grand total of two million pounds this year, or two-thirds of one per cent. of the arms expenditure). It means steeply rising prices, which are already being felt in every household. It means heavily intensified labour, overtime and speeding up, the extension of mass-production processes, the increased drawing in of women's and youth labour, and attacks on trade union rights and practices. It means at the same time, alongside continuing mass unemployment in the depressed areas, increased employment and demand for skilled labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the armaments centres, thus a bargaining power which had been weakened in the depression. All this creates the conditions for new economic struggles, and for successful economic struggles ; if the opportunity is not taken, the consequence can only be heavy lowering of the workers' conditions.

THE workers are well aware that the recent period of recovery from the depths of the economic crisis, even before the Arms Plan set in motion its own special forces to accentuate every feature of the picture, has seen rapidly rising profits, based on intensified exploitation of Labour, at the same time as real wages have actually fallen. In trade union circles the figures from official sources revealing the process between 1932 and 1936 have received wide currency. Between those years employment rose by 15.2 per cent., but output rose by 37.5 per cent., representing a rise in output per worker in those four years of no less than 19.1 per cent., or roughly one-fifth. In those same years profits rose by 52.2 per cent. But nominal wages rose by only 3.6 per cent. At the same time the cost of living, even according to the Ministry of Labour figure, rose from a monthly average of 144 in 1932 to 151 in December, 1936, or an increase of 5 per cent. All this was before the effects of the Arms Plan in 1937.

ACCORDING to Sir Josiah Stamp's index of profits, based on 1929 as 100, the index rose from 71.1 in 1932 to 114 in 1935, or a rise of 60 per cent. The *Economist* return of industrial profits shows a rise in the average dividend on ordinary capital from 5.9 per cent. in 1932 to 8.2 per cent. in 1936, and thereafter soaring to no less than 10.1 per cent. in the first quarter of 1937, or a net increase of 71 per cent. The Actuaries' Investment Index shows a rise in the market value of ordinary shares in miscellaneous industry from 47.9 in December, 1932, to 81.3 in December, 1936, and of iron and steel ordinary shares from 43.2 in December, 1932, to 83.0 in December, 1936, or an increase of 92 per cent. in value in four years. We have recently seen Vickers Ltd. declaring profits of £1,619,243, or an increase of a quarter-of-a-million pounds on the previous year ; Imperial Chemical Industries declaring a profit of £7.2 million, or an increase of half-a-million pounds ; and Sir Thomas Inskip admitting in the House of Commons that Handley Page showed a profit of 264 per cent.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT of wages? President Little of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, arguing the case for the wage increase demand in February of this year, stated:

> Consider for a moment what the working engineer has lost in the last four or five years. Between 1931 and the third quarter of 1935 he lost —taking into account the return of some of his paycuts—£53,500 a week in wages. This is a weighty figure and takes no account of accumulated losses.
>
> If we adopt, as we are justified in adopting, the cumulative method (that is, whereby the losses of 1931 are regarded as losses in each year since, the gains of 1934 as gains in each year since) you will find that *in the last 4¾ years the engineer has lost a total of no less than £23½ million.*

The *Economist*, of April 17, writes of the fall of real wages:

> Between 1933 and 1936 the level of real wages has been not quite maintained. Wage rates have increased by about 4½ per cent, but the cost of living has risen by about 5 per cent. Real wages, on the average of the year 1936, were within one per cent. of their 1933 peak. But by December, 1936, they were 2½ per cent. lower, and there have been further increases in the cost of living since the New Year.

On the now rapidly advancing rise in prices (which will be carried further forward by the Government's rearmament loan policy), the *Economist*, of April 3, writes:

> Already wholesale prices are rising at an alarming rate. Compared with only twelve months ago, our index number shows that, on the average, cereals and meat have risen by 22 per cent., other foods by 15 per cent., minerals by 26 per cent. and textiles by 15 per cent. The expected rise in the price of bread to the highest figure for nine years shows how the increase in wholesale prices is affecting the cost of living.

AT the same time, on the question of hours, with the advance of France and the United States to the forty-hour week, and on the questions of social legislation, with the new advances in France and the United States, especially with regard to holidays with pay, alongside the reactionary and unsatisfactory character of the Government's Factories Bill, the position in this country, which once led the way, is becoming a backward position. We may again quote the *Economist* of April 17:

> There is some danger of Britain's becoming a laggard in the matter of hours, since the 40-hour week is now observed in large sections of American and French industry. Britain does not wish to be left on a par with Japan or with the slave States over which the dictators rule.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In other words, Britain under the National Government is not only moving away from the democratic States to the grouping of the fascist States in respect of foreign policy, but, owing to the refusal of the united front and the People's Front by the Labour Party, i.e., even showing signs of moving towards the social and economic conditions of the fascist grouping.

FOR every trade unionist is compelled to recognise, and to draw practical conclusions from the fact that the advance in France and the United States is associated with the advance of unity, while the older and once more powerful movement in Britain has now, under the existing policies and leadership, fallen behind. In the United States the Committee of Industrial Organisation, working on the basis of industrial unionism, in close association with the Communist Party, against the old reactionary policies, has achieved its striking successes in breaking into the previously unorganised basic industries and compelling recognition and wholesale concessions. In France, the victory of the United Front has multiplied trade unionism five-fold, from 1,095,000 in December, 1935, to 4,900,000 in December, 1936, and won gains on a scale without parallel in trade union history. It is impossible for trade unionists in this country, observing these sweeping advances, to fail to contrast the relative stagnation and even loss of ground in Britain, the original home of trade unionism, under the policies of disunity and Black Circulars; (where unity has been realised, as in the South Wales Miners' Federation, a very different picture of striking advance is shown).

IT is clear that the whole position of trade unionism in Britain raises urgent problems. While membership is slowly rising and now approaching the four million mark, it is still less than two-thirds of the level of seventeen years ago, despite the increase in the total number of workers, and has fallen below the level of France, which has a much smaller number of employed workers. New industries and new industrial areas and mass-production plants have grown up, which are scarcely more than touched by trade unionism or even wholly outside (see especially J. R. Scott's article on "Greater London's Industries—A Problem for Trade Unionism," in last December's issue of this journal). Yet confusion and overlapping in organisation, and delay of amalgamation, still

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold up the task of organising these workers. While the fight against dilution is spoken of in resolutions and conferences, the actual process of dilution in the engineering trades has gone forward from roughly one-third of the industry before the war and one-half after the war to over two-thirds to-day, before the new Arms Plan drive. The new developments are above all built up on heavily exploited women's and youth labour. Between 1928 and 1933, according to the figures of the Engineering and Allied Employers' National Federation, the proportion of women employed in the engineering trades rose from 7.7 per cent. to 11.4 per cent., or an increase of nearly one-half. Yet there is still no concerted drive of trade unionism either to organise these workers or—what is the necessary condition of any success in this—to develop such forms of organisation, and programmes and activity corresponding to their conditions and interests, as will make it possible to organise them.

ALL this situation makes urgently necessary a concerted forward movement of trade unionism on the basis of a constructive programme of advance. The issues raised by the Unity Campaign, many of which are also expressed in the Labour Party Short Term Programme (although there given as only future aims for an eventual Labour Government, instead of being given as necessary aims for present action by the working class), especially the demands for increased wages, for the forty-hour week and for holidays with pay, together with special demands for the women workers and for the young workers, provide the basis for such a programme. In connection with and on the basis of such a programme of action it is necessary to develop trade union recruitment, to go forward with schemes of trade union unification and amalgamation, and to develop and strengthen workshop organisation in connection with the trade union local and district machinery. As an indispensable part of this strengthening and advance, it is equally necessary to carry forward the fight for effective democratic functioning within the unions and to repeal the discriminatory regulations which hamper unity. Such a constructive all-round programme of advance should now be the active concern of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress in conjunction with the Trade Union Executives. The demand for this, expressed by all militant trade unionists, becomes increasingly urgent in view of present economic conditions and the offensive of the Arms Plan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUT it is here that arises the other side of the picture in connection with the Arms Plan, which makes the peculiar conditions for the present stage of the struggle. For at the same time as the economic consequences of the Arms Plan accentuate and intensify every feature of the situation, impelling the workers to the necessity of new struggles, the very character of the Arms Plan leads the National Government and the employers to utilise every means, including extraordinary measures as in wartime, to prevent any struggles of the workers hampering its progress, and for this purpose to seek to tie up the workers' organisations to the war machine. They attempt to create an atmosphere in which any strike, however normal and limited in character, is denounced as a "political" attempt to "thwart the Arms Plan." Every attempt is made to build up a sentiment of "national unity" around the Arms Plan (the Coronation theatricals and insincerity are a typical part of this), to exploit also the anti-fascist feelings of the workers in order to win support for the Arms Plan, to win on this basis the co-operation of the trade union leadership, as in wartime, for industrial peace, to prepare special coercive measures against the militant workers, and so to utilise the Arms Plan in order to throttle and defeat the rising struggle of the workers. If the working-class movement is not prepared for this, by the clearness of its positive policy on rearmament and the fight against the National Government, the rising movement will be taken in the flank and will have to face a fire on two fronts. *At the same time, as the present situation is exceptionally favourable for economic advance, it is also necessary to be prepared for an extreme offensive against the very basis of the working-class movement.*

IN the war of 1914-18, the Treasury Agreement, by which the trade union leadership allied themselves with the Government and pledged themselves to industrial peace, was followed by the Munitions Act and the Munitions Tribunals, establishing compulsory arbitration and abolishing the right to strike. There is no doubt that the National Government to-day is once again thinking with war-time models in mind, and is actively concerned to win the pledged co-operation of the trade union leadership. In the White Paper on Rearmament of March, 1936, the Government already declared:

> What we have to do is to carry through, in a limited period of time, measures which will make exceptionally heavy demands upon certain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> branches of industry and upon certain classes of labour, without impeding the course of normal trade. This will require the most careful organisation and the willing co-operation both of the leaders of industry and of the Trade Unions if our task is to be successfully fulfilled. The Government have every confidence that these conditions will be fulfilled.

In November, 1936, the Arms Commission Report declared:

> The problems involved in formulating plans for the conscription of industry in wartime will have to be faced, and should be faced without delay.

In December, 1936, the Prime Minister, Baldwin, made direct reference to the possible necessity of "sterner steps" and special "powers":

> If for any reason of shortage of materials or any other difficulty, the time should come when I and my colleagues feel that sterner steps are necessary to complete the programme we have in view, I shall not hesitate to come down to this House and ask for all the powers I need.

A series of incidents, notably the dockyards dismissals without charge or hearing, has shown the special police measures taken by the Government to create an atmosphere of political intimidation in the arms industries, as well as to build up an elaborate spying system in key factories and plants against the militant workers. The press has reported that legislation on the lines of the wartime Munitions Act has already been considered by the Cabinet and is ready to be placed on the Statute Book in case of need at short notice. *The menace of Industrial Conscription, striking at the very basis of trade unionism and the right to strike, is a real one.*

IN this situation the rôle of the official trade union leadership is of critical importance. And it is just in this situation that the tendencies to unity with the National Government over rearmament, on the part both of the political Labour leadership and the trade union leadership, have been accompanied, on the side of ruling forces of the trade union leadership, by urgent appeals to the Government for "co-operation" and by an intensified offensive against strikes, against working-class unity and against trade union militants. The A.E.U. *Monthly Journal* in October, 1936, declared:

> Nothing could be more calamitous than an outbreak of trade disputes at this stage of the economic revival.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pleas for co-operation with the National Government over rearmament find expression in the A.E.U. *Monthly Journal* for March of this year and in the *Railway Review* of February 26. The General Council comes out with its circular to Trades Councils warning against unofficial strikes. The *Daily Herald* comes out with a series of articles warning against unofficial strikes. The Electrical Trade Union expels its London Central Committee for supporting the Earl's Court strike. The A.E.U. Executive suspends its Barrow District Committee for placing a ban on overtime at Vickers', and expels the Chairman of its London District Committee for assisting the Rolls Royce strike. All these are menacing signs which play straight into the hands of the Government's offensive.

BEHIND the misleading issue of " unofficial strikes " lies concealed the real issue of the strike movement. For the real question is not the antithesis between official and unofficial strikes, but the necessity that the trade union movement as a whole shall fulfil its function of leading the workers' economic struggles in the present critical stage. The unofficial strike is always a symptom, never a choice. It is obvious that the unofficial strike will never be chosen in preference to the strike with the full power of trade union organisation and finance behind it. If, therefore, the unofficial strike breaks out on any large scale, it means that (as during the war) there is something wrong with the functioning of trade unionism. The unofficial strike is a symptom of the official Industrial Truce, or, as to-day, of tendencies to choke and block any movement of advance by over-complicated and protracted negotiating machinery which plays into the hands of the employers. The remedy for this lies, not in abstract homilies, nor in expelling militants and disrupting unity, but in giving a real united leadership of trade unionism as a whole for the advancing movement.

IT is therefore evident that the present rising working-class advance is faced with the most urgent problems, to overcome these obstacles and dangers, before the Government's offensive has proceeded further, and to realise a united forward movement with the full strength of the working-class organisations. There is every prospect that the strength of the present advance will be able to overcome the obstacles. The most recent signs of the Miners' National Conference and strike ballot

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in support of the Notts Miners and the Harworth men, and the securing of recognition by the A.E.U. Executive of the Beardmore strike, no less than the busmen's stand and the spirit among the railwaymen, all point this way. *But it is necessary to recognise that, unless this united forward movement is realised in the immediate future, the situation is fraught with danger.* Never was the need for unity, not merely as a general aim, but in the immediate present struggles, more urgent. To these questions the Unity Campaign will have increasingly to address itself in the period now opening. And the whole group of problems of the new stage of working class advance, in relation to the general political perspective of the fight against the National Government and the fight for peace, will have to be reviewed anew, with guiding lines for the whole decisive period now opening, by the Communist Party Congress which meets at the end of this month.

R. P. D.

Every Trade Union Official should have this book:

TRADE UNION ACCOUNTING

AND FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

3/6 net (3/10 By Post.)

By A. E. Ward, A.C.C.S., A.F.T.C., and C. R. Sweetingham. With a Foreword by John Marchbank, General Secretary, N.U.R. "This handbook should be of practical value to officials of the various Unions and others keen to play their part in the work of the Movement and to understand all aspects of its organization."
—*The TRADE UNIONIST.*

Order from a bookseller or direct from

PITMAN, Parker St., Kingsway, W.C.2

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REARMAMENT AND THE LABOUR PARTY

By E. SHINWELL, M.P.

[*Following the discussion of Labour Policy on Rearmament initiated by A. F. Papworth in the March issue of the* LABOUR MONTHLY, *and continued by D. N. Pritt, M.P. and R. P. Dutt in the April issue, we print below a contribution from E. Shinwell, M.P.*]

WHATEVER views are held in the Labour Movement regarding the Government's armaments programme it is indisputable that the production of arms on an unprecedented scale is an accomplished fact.

Nor is it possible that any action taken by the Parliamentary Labour Party, even if they were so disposed, would succeed in preventing the Government from carrying through that programme to its ultimate limit.

Speeches in Parliament may worry the Government, but power resides in those who possess the requisite number of votes to flood the division lobbies, nor is the Government likely to be disturbed in their aim by Parliamentary obstruction, however capably conducted.

The armaments programme may be seriously arrested by strikes in munition factories, aircraft establishments, and in ship-building yards engaged in the production of warships. Yet, although disputes have occurred, it is doubtful whether they are intended to effect more than a moderate increase in wage rates.

But any attempt to destroy the Government's armaments plans by industrial action might meet with severe reprisals, and in the end prove disastrous to the whole Labour movement. At any rate both the Labour Party and the Trade Unions are opposed to the use of industrial action on a national scale as a method of arresting the growth of armaments. Whether the Labour movement desires seriously to curtail the production of armaments is another matter. With the best of pacific intentions, and with every desire to prevent another war, there exists within the Labour movement, even in circles whose pacifism is unquestionable, a deep-seated fear of a menace just as deadly and as destructive of working-class liberty.

It is represented by Hitlerism, by the bellicose utterances of Mussolini, by the destruction of democracy in several European countries and elsewhere, and by all those elements whose sole purpose is to frustrate the approach of the workers to economic and social power.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not disputed that in our own country Fascist tendencies are manifest, that the almost certain dislocation of capitalist industry, following the present boom, may precipitate an attack on existing democratic institutions ; but the traditional character of those institutions, *coupled with the strength of the Labour movement*, constitute a bulwark against fascism which no other country can claim to possess.

On this assumption, the Labour movement is more apprehensive regarding a combined attack by Germany and Italy on Great Britain, possibly with Japan given a free hand in the Pacific ; nor is the possibility of an ideological alignment of forces ignored.

Russia still remains a strong temptation for the Fascist countries, and any attempt to interfere with the striking Socialist experiment in that country must be sternly resisted by the workers here, whatever the Government might be disposed to do. Meanwhile, the League of Nations, while in embryo the only satisfactory instrument in the approach to a permanent peace, cannot be regarded as immediately practicable for resisting aggression. Sound as the principle of collective security is, there is, so far as one can see, no immediate hope of its accomplishment. In these circumstances what is the position of the Labour movement in Great Britain ?

Undoubtedly there are differences of opinion within the Labour Party on foreign policy and rearmament, which chiefly date from the Italo-Abyssinian affair. Yet on reflection it will not be denied that the policy of sanctions was the right one. If sanctions had been fully applied by the British Government it is doubtful whether Mussolini would have succeeded in his sinister design.

A League of Nations strongly fortified by its members, accepting whole-heartedly the principle of the collective peace system, and using combined force, economic and military, against the aggressor, is therefore seen as a proposition not to be lightly abandoned.

Moreover, if it be true that the National Government was responsible for the betrayal of Abyssinia, it is reasonable to believe that had a Labour Government been in office the position might have been reversed. The view that action need not proceed beyond the use of economic sanctions cannot be seriously considered, except as a refuge for those who cherish the infantile notion that one can threaten an opponent successfully without possessing resources capable of resisting an attack.

We can no longer disguise the fact that support for the League, or association with a European bloc, or pacts of mutual assistance, or the so-called peace pacts recently advocated at the conference of the Co-operative Party suggest the use of force. It is sheer hypocrisy, or downright foolishness, to maintain our resolve to deal with an aggressor but neglect to provide the most effective means of applying our resolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is on this issue, the use of force, and the circumstances in which it might properly be used, that confusion within the Labour movement exists, and from such confusion springs the present controversy.

Before we come to certain aspects of this controversy let me deal with the criticism levelled against the Labour Party in Parliament.

From the vague utterances of the critics it is possible to extract one idea ; namely, that the Parliamentary Party have not been forcible enough in their opposition to the Government's foreign and armaments policy.

It is also alleged against the Parliamentary Party, and the Labour Party itself is included in the indictment, that they have ranged themselves alongside the Government in supporting the production of armaments, and in preparation for war. Now, although there is not a word of truth in this allegation, the implied suggestion that an opposition should never support the Government is just nonsense.

If, as a result of prolonged agitation by the Party, and the pressure of public opinion, the Government introduce legislation which responds to Labour opinion, it is futile to oppose. There are occasions when an opposition must offer constructive proposals and be ready to give its consent to items in government policy. Otherwise we are fooling the workers and following the traditional practices of the almost defunct Liberal Party.

The Parliamentary Party have repeatedly declared their distrust of the National Government in the realm of foreign policy, have sought to extract every possible League commitment in the course of debate, they have demanded assurances that armaments should not be used for imperialistic ends without the jurisdiction of the League ; they have denounced the Government for their betrayal of the League, specifying Japan and Italy ; they have warned the Government that should war come they would be held responsible ; they have asserted the Nation's right to conscript wealth if we are summoned to repel an invader, and they have voted almost solidly against the Service Estimates as a protest against Government handling of foreign affairs.

I cannot see what more could have been done, unless to present the philosophy of the absolute pacifist, which is not the policy of the Party, or to declare, as some have done, that we should take no measures to defend the country, even against a Fascist invader, until we have a workers' Government, a policy which seems to ignore the possibility that in such circumstances we might never have such a Government.

As it may be argued that the absolute pacifist outlook is the correct one, I respond by admitting the sincerity of those who declare that in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no circumstances would they take steps to defend themselves, and that war is futile ; but I reject the view that in a world where capitalism is on the decline, where nations build armaments on a huge scale in order to protect or promote their economic interests, or it may be for other reasons ; racial, or the lust for power (I shall not argue the matter at this stage), we can defend the interests of the workers by folding our arms, or by passing resolutions.

The world may be moved by moral gestures, but we have had many since the last war, and so futile have these proved that we are now engaged in the most intense armaments race the world has ever known.

Equally the Labour movement rejects the view that we can ignore this situation until the people have elected a Labour Government, when presumably we are to begin afresh, in a new atmosphere of our own creation, and then decide whether we shall have armaments or not, or whether we shall defend ourselves or not, or whether we should assist in building a League of Nations or not. Both these views appear to ignore things as they really are. In my judgment they are far removed from a sound Socialist strategy.

If I have any criticism to advance, either of the Labour Party, or any section of our movement, it is the tendency to indulge in abstract speculation, in academic theorising, and a disposition to run with the peace hares and hunt with the war hounds. Frequently our resolutions and discussions are divorced from reality, and have no relation to the actual facts.

We are a peace Party, yet display no reluctance in advising the natives of Abyssinia to maintain the struggle against their Italian aggressors ; we commend the valiant endeavours of the Spanish militia against Franco and his fascists, we look with approval on the armed might of Russia, deplore any weakening of French resolve to resist with force the German menace ; while in all our socialist hearts there is a sentiment which inspires us to applaud any effort to humble international fascism, either through force or any other means.

In all this there is no actual dilemma ; rather a recognition, conscious or otherwise, that post-war peace efforts have proved fruitless, that the problems thrown up by modern capitalism are conducive to war, and that peace propaganda alone is insufficient to arrest the growth of armaments.

It cannot be denied that armaments breed armaments, that wars solve no problems, yet it is equally true that an overpowering display of force can be an effective deterent in preventing the outbreak of hostilities.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is not the issue for the Labour movement one, not so much of immediate national disarmament, but rather that of deciding how huge air, military and naval forces are to be controlled, and to what end they are to be used ?

And is not the situation still more complicated by the rise of fascism in Europe, the megalomania of Mussolini and of Hitler ? Who can tell when either of these dictators will strike ? And at whom ? And for what purpose ?

And if we cannot trust the National Government in our own land, affected by Parliamentary traditions and influenced by public opinion, in a half-baked democracy, can we trust Germany and Italy where every vestige of democratic opinion is ruthlessly suppressed ?

Let us enter the realms of speculation for a moment, but merely for the purpose of illustration.

Should Germany attack Russia (perhaps a remote possibility) what is likely to be the action of the Labour movement ?

In the more likely contingency of a German attack on France are we to remain passive ? Is the destruction of French democracy desirable ?

Assume an air raid on London by German bombers. Are we expected to prevent our air raid precautions from becoming effective ?

Departing from this atmosphere of speculation we emerge into the arena of action, and postulate the policy, which the Labour movement, consistent with its principles, must adopt.

We shall continue to denounce the National Government for their past blunders and their existing foreign and domestic policy. We must never tire of directing attention to the inherent contradictions within capitalism, the ruthless competition among capitalist nations in the search for markets, the exploitation of subject races, and the grab and hold policy of imperialism, which are the most prolific causes of war.

We shall seek to rebuild the League of Nations by exerting all possible pressure on the National Government ; express our readiness to renounce national sovereignty, to accept, the principle of arbitration in international disputes, and to place in the hands of an International organisation the forces, military and economic, to deal with any aggressor.

We must relentlessly expose the armaments ramp, the muddle and profiteering, the reckless speculation in commodities intended for armaments production, and demand the exclusive control of all establishments engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war.

We must make it clear, beyond any possibility of doubt, that we shall resist by all the means at our disposal any attempt by Fascist nations to force their doctrines upon us ; nor should we neglect the opportunity of warning our present rulers that should any attempt be made to impose

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any such doctrines in this country we shall resist, not only by exercising whatever constitutional rights remain, but by the use of extra-constitutional means, whatever the consequences.

To this end the whole movement, in its organisation and in its propaganda, must be tightened up immediately in order to create a public opinion against the present Government, to force a general election, and to pave the way for a Labour Government. Finally, it would be of infinite value if the Labour movement, representative of all sections, made it known to the Government that no support would be accorded in any war in which there was the slightest suspicion of Imperialism, that while the League remained in its present moribund condition, our relations with France, Russia, the Scandinavia countries, the United States and other anti-fascist nations should be strengthened, that Germany and Italy should be warned in the bluntest possible fashion that any attempt by them to disturb the peace of Europe would meet with the utmost resistance ; that the so-called volunteers should be immediately withdrawn from the Spanish struggle, and that the ordinary courtesies of international law should be accorded to the Spanish Government.

And should war on any large scale occur, despite our peace efforts, the Labour movement must not neglect the opportunity of effecting a change in the Government of the country, to weaken capitalist power, to resist the menace of foreign fascism, and to destroy the budding growths of fascism in our own land.

To Overseas Readers :

Following on many requests we now have a supply of binding cases for 1936—as used by ourselves—which we mail at the price of 2/9 post free.

The case is complete with the title, volume and date in gold lettering.

Send to us at : 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MONARCHY FETISH

By T. A. JACKSON

ONE result of the abdication of Edward VIII. was that Republican sentiments were avowed and debated in the House of Commons for the first time for a generation, remarks Mr. Kingsley Martin in his little book, *The Magic of Monarchy*.* But this—though regarded " by most English people as a shocking novelty "—was " a revival, not an innovation." The practice of surrounding the monarch with a halo of systematically manufactured adulation—a practice which culminates in the notion (seriously advanced by an Archbishop) that the Coronation ceremony actually and in fact turns a human being into something super human, " the *incarnation* of his people "—is far from being an old-established English custom. In actual fact it is a cult which dates no further back than to the days of Disraeli, and the cunning which made him see (and seize) the chance to weld into a triple fetish of compelling power, loyalty to the Queen, pride in the Empire, and faith in the sanity and integrity of the Tory Party.

It was an innovation, resented as a piece of " Petticoat Lane vulgarity " when, in 1876, Disraeli persuaded Parliament to agree to confer upon the Queen the title of " Empress of India." It was an innovation, tolerated by the general public as much out of politeness to an old lady as on any other ground, when the Party he had trained used the 50th anniversary of Queen Victoria's accession as the occasion for an elaborate military pageant and organised " national rejoicing." But, ten years later, the second or " Diamond " Jubilee showed the cult established so firmly that only a rump of the Liberal Party was left to protest, stubbornly, against this new-fangled cult of " Imperialism " with a sacrosanct monarchy as its central symbol, and the Tory Party as its hereditary High-Priests and acolytes.

Mr. Kingsley Martin quotes examples of the extent to which the superstition has gone—letters to the *Times* and the *Telegraph* solemnly suggesting that " there must be something more than mere coincidence in the fact that our uncertain weather has been uniformly favourable on State occasions to his late Majesty King George V.," and that " the stars were unusually brilliant during King George's Jubilee week," and so on. He exposes the way in which sychophantic adulation of the Royal Family and everything connected with them, has been as systematically written

* *The Magic of Monarchy*, by Kingsley Martin. Nelson. 2/6 net.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up, boosted, and bally-hooed in the Press, as anything else the advertising specialists have taken in hand to " sell " to the public.

What he does not notice is the fact that a second generation has grown up which has been accustomed from childhood to regard this sort of sap-headed irrationalism as of the essence of " loyalty " ; so much so that nearly every master printer in London believes, rightly or wrongly, that penalties heavy enough to ensure bankruptcy will be his reward if he lends his plant and imprint to the production of any sort of openly avowed Republican propaganda. Three separate master printers have at different times assured the present writer that they were afraid of the consequences of printing statements of a Republican tendency which they believed to be true in point of fact, fair comment on matters of public interest, and quite unobjectionable in their wording, but which, because of their Republicanism, were capable of being represented as an " attack upon the King." Block-makers likewise, within my experience, have refused to engrave cartoons for similar reasons.

It is not only that a superstitious, flunkey-minded attitude towards the institution of monarchy, and towards the persons of the Royal Family has spread among the public at large in Britain. What has to be faced is that this attitude has been deliberately created by the Tory Party, by the financial oligarchy behind the Tory Party and the " National " Government. And by that large and powerful section of the Civil Service bureaucracy which is allied to both bodies, through the instrumentality of every agency for influencing public opinion which these forces have at command—the pulpit, the schools, the Press and the cinema—reinforced covertly, by the carefully-spread fear of drastic legal penalties awaiting non-compliance with this cult.

* * * *

The extent to which the evil has gone can be estimated from the extent to which the Labour movement has become tainted with it.

When in the early 70's of the last century a definite Republican movement sprang up in Britain—(between the breakdown of the First International, after the Commune, and the revival of a specifically Socialist movement in 1882-3)—the leading trade unionists of Britain, led by George Odger, took their places on its platform side by side with Charles Bradlaugh. When the Democratic Federation (afterwards the Social Democratic Federation) was founded in 1881, it put the abolition of the monarchy at the head of its programme quite as a matter of course. Keir Hardie, equally as a matter of course, opposed grants to Royalty from the floor of the House of Commons in 1893.

By the time the Labour Party first appeared in force in the House of Commons in 1906, a change had come over the leadership. The Fabian Society had become avowedly Imperialist. Philip Snowden and Ramsay MacDonald, long before either of them found his way to the Treasury

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bench, vied with each other in assuring the public that Socialism and Monarchy were quite compatible with each other—that, in fact, a popular and humane-minded monarch might be an invaluable aid in overcoming the prejudices of the reactionary interests. In the '70's, a music-hall comedian could and did include in a list of incredible things that might happen if ever he "ceased to love," the prospect of the Queen having Odger "as a second-floor lodger."

To-day it is a mere commonplace for a trade union leader or a Labour politician to accept from the Crown the knighthood that Odger and Bradlaugh would have spurned, or the peerage that even Gladstone begged, respectfully, to be allowed to decline.

* * * *

What is the explanation for this reversion to superstition? How is it that even the Labour movement has become corrupted, and to the extent it has?

A remark of Engels gives us the clue. Writing to Bernstein on March 24, 1884, he says:

> The liberal constitutional-monarchy is an adequate form of bourgeois domination: (1) at the beginning when the bourgeoisie have not quite finished with absolute monarchy, and (2) at the end when the proletariat has already made the democratic republic too dangerous. And yet the democratic republic always remains the last form of bourgeois domination, that in which it is broken to pieces.—*Selected Correspondence* of Marx and Engels (Martin Lawrence) p. 435.

Disraeli's manœuvre—his annexation of the Crown as the political property of the Tory Party, his elevation of the Empire to the status of a fetish, and his initiation of an irrational emotional cult around these symbols—came at a critical moment. On the one side economic needs were making absolutely indispensable a monopoly-grip upon sources of supply of raw materials, upon markets for disposal of manufactured products, upon areas for investment and exploitation, and upon the means of communication between them. On the other, the growth of the proletariat, not only in numbers and in organisation, but in understanding and in militancy, was a possibility which threatened the whole process of Empire organisation. And, capable of serving as a decisive ally of the proletariat in its class-struggle, was the whole body of the militant, Radical, Republican petit bourgeoisie.

Increasingly, after 1870, British capitalism, spurred on by the competition of the rival capitalisms of the Continent and the U.S.A., turned its attention to the annexation and development of Africa. Gladstone's Government of 1880-1885, the last stand of old-style, individualist-reformist, anti-Imperialist, Liberalism, came to grief largely because it found itself at every turn entangled in questions of Empire, in the Transvaal and Zululand, in Egypt, in Afghanistan, in the Sudan, and in Ireland. Save for their transient triumph in 1893-5—a hollow victory

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was really a defeat, since only with the votes of the disunited Irish party were the Liberals in a majority—Liberalism went into permanent opposition until the landslide of 1906. And that, in its turn, marked the completeness of the change, since the neo-Liberalism was now avowedly Imperialist.

* * * *

One aspect of the organised idolatry which began with the Jubilee of 1887, and bids fair to break all records at the Coronation of 1937, must be stressed. The whole cult has been organised, systematically and deliberately, as a defence of the existing order against a double-danger: (1) A predatory attack upon the British Empire by a rival Empire; (2) A revolutionary attack—whether by the home proletariat, by the subjected colonial peoples, or by both together—upon the social order which monarchism and imperialism symbolise.

When, at the Coronation, a large part in the procession will be taken by military display in which colonial contingents and contingents from the Dominions are prominent, the purpose goes far beyond providing the public with a display of varigated and novel uniforms. It continues the practice of previous displays—especially of the second Victorian Jubilee, which heralded the Boer War—the practice originated in 1878, where Disraeli strained the law and the constitution on the pretext of a tension in the Eastern Question, to concentrate at Malta 8,000 troops transported from India. It had its effect. Disraeli had not studied the methods of P. J. Barnum for nothing. He literally "advertised" the British Empire as the Greatest Show on Earth. The new imperialism gave a new word to the language. For it was during this "crisis" that the Great MacCormack first sang "we don't want to fight but by jingo if we do!" from which inspiring ballad "Jingoism" derives its name.

The whole cult of royalism plus the pageantry with which on occasion it is organised, serves the two-edged purpose of war-preparation. First the monarch is advertised in every possible way as the embodiment of every possible bourgeois virtue—one who would be the last person in the world to "want to fight." Then, on ceremonial occasions, that same monarch is revealed, as it were by accident, as possessed of enormous and incalculable military resources—(by jingo! *if* we *do* fight!"). So on one side the monarch makes a personal "heart" appeal to every "sucker" within reach of the propaganda, and on the other "his-and-our" Empire is revealed as the Greatest Show on Earth, well worth fighting for, and virtually invincible.

* * * *

That the whole cult is a deliberate humbug was revealed in the case of Edward VIII. In one week the people of Britain were taught that Edward was (1) likely to be the greatest and best-balanced monarch the country ever had; and (2) an undesirable which the country was well

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rid of. Nothing could better have revealed the fact that monarchism provides the financial oligarchy who rule the British Empire with just the camouflage they want for concealing the reality of their rule, and just the apparatus they want, on occasion, for over-riding, or side-tracking the " democratic will of the people."

Edward VIII did not fit in to the façade. He was bored by routine and Court retainers, wouldn't go to church and wanted to marry the girl he fancied. No errand boy who didn't suit was ever so easily sacked.

* * * *

But if that is the true reading of the case, surely, by now, the working-class movement of the country can take the hint ?

In the days when England was the England of traditional glory, such sychophantic imbecility as is now evidenced on every side—when the combination of colours, red-white-and-blue, is popularly supposed to be, by Divine ordinance, specially British, regardless of the fact that it is also " national " to France, Holland, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia, the U.S.A., Guatemala, and a few other South American Republics, to say nothing of Tsarist Russia—would have been laughed to scorn. The Elizabethans tolerated (and flattered) " Good Queen Bess " because the alternative was a bloody scramble between greedy merchants and kulak-aristocrats. The men of the 17th century abandoned a Republic only because an intensifying class-strife made a monarchy the form of government which divided the possessing classes least, and gave them their best common front against the common people. If, contrary to all contemporary expectations, Victoria was not Britain's last monarch, it was from a parallel cause—the fear of the common people, reinforced by the need of maintaining the Empire against its rivals as a means of maintaining capitalism at its heart and centre.

When monarchy ceases to be a camouflage behind which a predatory oligarchy can best organise its defences, external and internal, monarchy itself can be sacked as Edward VIII was sacked, and the attempt made to substitute Fascist leader-worship for monarchy fetish-worship. That is why the struggle for a democratic republic is a part of the struggle for democracy itself.

Australasia ! Books for Sale !

The volumes of the LABOUR MONTHLY, Nos. 1 to 8, in good and clean condition, bound, are for sale at £10 the lot. If you are interested in the bargain, write to Mr. A. S. Morris, Basement Book Co., 725 George Street, Sydney, N.S.W.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SPAIN: THE RECORD OF TRANSPORT HOUSE

By "U.H.P."

IT is now clear that the joint meeting of the Labour and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions, in March, convened on the demand of the Spanish Socialist and trade union movement for an all-in world Conference, was a complete fiasco. The fact that the Spanish delegates repudiated any responsibility whatsoever for the resolution adopted is a sufficiently humiliating and eloquent proof of that. And the continued refusal of Mr. Bevin to publish his speech at the Conference, in spite of the most disturbing rumours as to its character, throws additional light on the nature of the proceedings.

But this fiasco and its circumstances are not the most tragic side of the Conference. Most tragic of all is the fact that the attitude of the British Labour leaders was the latest link in a long chain of methodical betrayal of their Spanish comrades.

This is a serious charge. Yet it would be justified by the mere fact that once again, in the House of Commons debate on the British Government's alliance with Franco to blockade Bilbao, the Government's spokesmen were able to point unchallenged to the crucial fact that last autumn the Labour leaders had already accepted the swindle of "non-intervention." But if further chapter and verse are required for so damning a charge, they are, unfortunately, forthcoming only too abundantly.

Already on August 28, 1936, six weeks after the outbreak of the Fascist insurrection, Mr. Bevin—and with him a solid block of opinion among the labour leaders—made their position clear at a joint meeting of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, the National Executive of the Labour Party, and the Parliamentary Labour Party. His position was that, unfortunately, nothing could be done to help Spanish democracy, but that we must be prepared to fight next time democracy was menaced by Fascist aggression. In other words, he wrote off the defence of Spanish democracy as a bad debt. This was in private.

But a fortnight later, at the Plymouth Trade Union Congress on September 10, Sir Walter Citrine was giving in public the reasons for supporting "non-intervention." They are set forth in the verbatim report of the discussion, issued by the T.U.C. as a twopenny pamphlet, entitled "The Spanish Problem."

Sir Walter first explained that the Spanish Government was in urgent need of and had a clear right to obtain war material from abroad.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He then said that it was impossible to restrain the Italian and German Governments from supplying arms to the rebels except by force, and that one could in no circumstances rely on the word of these governments to carry out a policy of non-intervention: nor was it possible to devise non-intervention machinery which could secure the agreement being loyally and faithfully carried out. After this Sir Walter went on to argue that non-intervention was the best policy in the interests of the Spanish Government and concluded by quoting and subsequently elaborating and endorsing the view given him at the Foreign Office that:

> Whatever the technical rights of the Spanish Government, they had to be considered against a much larger and much greater and graver question. They foresaw that in the event of the Powers supplying munitions to Spain you would have the Powers in Europe forming into two rival blocs. On the one side you would have the Fascist Powers, and on the other side you would have such democratic Powers as were ready to go on supplying arms. They felt that would inevitably mean that sooner or later there would be conflict in Spain between the Powers, which would rapidly spread to the whole of Europe itself.

It is obvious that these arguments flatly contradict each other, and cannot possibly all be true. It is equally clear that the policy of preventing Europe being divided into rival blocs by the simple expedient of the democracies surrendering to Fascist aggression is a policy of suicide, and a betrayal of civilisation through cowardice.

But what is even more remarkable than the contradictory nature of the arguments employed is the argument that is *not* employed. No one is more persistently eloquent than Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Bevin on the necessity for being prepared to take the risk of war in defence of the collective system. Why, then, did neither of them say a word about the fact that Spain is a member of the League of Nations, and as such entitled to the protection of Article 10 of the Covenant, which declares it to be the duty of every member of the League to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of any member State against aggression? Sir Walter Citrine made it very clear in his speech that Germany and Italy were behind the rebels from the start and determined to go on supplying them with arms, munitions, aeroplanes, pilots, etc. Why, then, did neither he nor Mr. Bevin whisper a single word about this country's plain duty under the Covenant to insist upon supplying the Spanish Government with all the arms, aeroplanes and volunteers it needed to repel this aggression?

For the simple reason that they were out to make a case for "non-intervention," and that (as the contradictory nature and the variety of their arguments showed) their real reasons for demanding "non-intervention" were not such that they could be publicly avowed.

What were the real reasons? The following information does not emanate from nor is it in any way authorised by Mr. Lansbury. But

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it may be stated categorically that, when he attempted at the beginning of August to stir up such leaders of the Labour Movement as he could find in order to hold an urgent meeting of the Joint Executives to consider the Spanish situation, he was given to understand by Sir Walter Citrine that it was necessary to go slow and be careful, because the struggle in Spain was at least in part one between the rival extremisms of Communism and Fascism. A second real but private motive—fear of Catholic opinion—has been freely admitted to many persons by Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Bevin in private conversation, notably with Spanish comrades, some of whom were themselves Catholics.

A third real but unavowed motive for supporting " non-intervention " is the fear of being accused by the Government of " war-mongering." This fear has also been so often confessed behind the scenes by the Labour leaders that it has penetrated, not only to the ears of the rank and file, but also to those of the Tories. The result was evident at various by-elections, where the Labour condidate, on instructions from Transport House, attempted to avoid all reference to Fascist intervention in Spain, and was rewarded by a Tory offensive accusing Labour of wanting war on behalf of Spain. The Tories have employed the same tactics in the House : and each time the Labour reply has been a feeble wriggle, making the worst of both worlds by trying to sit on the fence in some kind of no man's land between supporting and repudiating the farce of " non-intervention."

The existence of this third motive was pretty plainly indicated by Sir Walter Citrine in his speech at the Plymouth Congress :

> . . . . If there is no other means except naval action or military action to restrain a Hitler and a Mussolini, dare I tie the British Labour Movement, dare I tie British public opinion to take that sort of action ? Frankly, friends, I could not say " Yes " to that . . . .
>
> Is any democratic Power ready to take the risk of war on an incident of this kind ? Certainly the French Government is not, unless it can be assured that it has the overwhelming backing of Great Britain and other Powers. That was the state of things when we made our first report to the National Council of Labour. . . . . An agreement was in the process of formation. Could we do anything at that stage which could revoke that agreement or get a sufficient public opinion behind it to cause its revocation ? We felt it was dangerous even to try.

This statement imputes to the whole Labour movement the cowardice of its reactionary leaders. They demanded sanctions when it came to defending China against Japanese aggression, and in words accepted the risk of war when it came to demanding effective sanctions against Italy over Abyssinia. Why, then, did they refuse to demand the application of the Covenant on behalf of Spanish democracy ?

But inadvertently Sir Walter Citrine's statement lets the cat out of the bag completely by admitting that French support of " non-intervention "

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was due to the knowledge that the British Government would leave France in the lurch if she allowed the Spanish Government to buy arms and munitions. This shows that Sir Walter knew all the time that the Blum Government had gone in for "non-intervention" only under direct British pressure. The admission is of the first importance, because Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Bevin devoted considerable time to misleading the Trade Union Congress on this very point.

Not to put too fine a point on it, they tried to make it appear that the Blum Government was wholly responsible for the policy of "non-intervention." Yet the facts of British pressure on the French Government were indeed notorious by the time Sir Walter Citrine spoke on September 10. It may be stated categorically that these facts had been impressed upon Labour leaders at every one of the numerous meetings that took place from July 28 on. But they refused to attach any credence to what they were told by French Socialists. They preferred, as we shall see, to take the word of the Foreign Office and Mr. Eden to the contrary. Their conduct indeed was exactly the same as the continued statements of the Foreign Office, that it had "no information" to justify the belief that Italian troops had been landed in Spain.

From the first moment of its accession to power, the Blum Government, rightly or wrongly, took the view that it could not afford to break with Great Britain and be isolated in face of Germany and Italy. For this reason the French Government passively followed the British lead in raising sanctions against Italy.

Soon after this event, which took place in the beginning of July, the Spanish rebellion began (July 18). On July 23 and 24, M. Blum and his Foreign Minister, M. Delbos, were in London discussing foreign affairs with the British Government.

The next day the French Government held a special Cabinet meeting on which the *Daily Telegraph* reported (July 27):

> It was announced officially that the Government would adopt a policy of "strict neutrality" towards the conflict in Spain. The Cabinet meeting which made this decision was stormy . . . . It is thought that the fear of arousing Conservative opinion in Great Britain, and so compromising Franco-British relations, told powerfully on the Cabinet . . . . The Royalist *Action Francaise* alleges that during the recent visit to London of M. Blum and M. Delbos, the Foreign Minister, they were warned by Mr. Eden of the very serious consequences which might result from French participation in the Spanish civil war.

Mr. Alexander Werth, whose book "The Destiny of France," proves that he speaks with intimate knowledge of French politics, states (p. 379) that one reason for the French Cabinet's decision (on August 8) to apply "non-intervention" immediately and unilaterally.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> was British pressure ; the other reason, equally important, was the determination of M. Delbos and certain other Radical Ministers to adhere wholly to the British policy of abstention . . . .
>
> There is, of course, not the slightest doubt that, about August 1, the British Government clearly intimated to the French Government that if, as a result of her " competition " with Italy and Germany in sending arms to Spain, France were attacked by the Fascist countries, Britain would not consider the attack an unprovoked one, and the *Locarno guarantee would not come into operation.*

In the light of these now notorious facts, which, it must be repeated, were at that time well known to Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Bevin, the statements made by the latter at the T.U.C. are hardly compatible with a scrupulous regard for truth. Sir Walter Citrine :

> We found that the French Government had made a decision the effect of which was that it would not supply the Spanish Government with arms and munitions . . . . What could one do ? Socialists could not understand that attitude ; Spanish comrades were completely non-plussed. Here is a Government, formed of our own comrades in the main, supported by the mass of working-class opinion in France, and they say : " They cannot supply us with munitions on account of the risk of war." Our position, therefore, was this : here we saw, first of all, the stoppage of munitions by France itself, and secondly, an attempt to get other Governments to follow suit. We had to consider what we could do to try to change that policy . . . .
>
> We decided we had no alternative but to publish a manifesto declaring in unmistakable terms the right of the Spanish Government to be supplied with the munitions it needed. We took that risk, and our declaration was published.

What reckless fellows to take such a risk ! On the principle, presumably, that if it came to bamboozling the Trade Union Congress it was necessary to lay it on with a trowel, Sir Walter concluded by stating that the information brought back by Labour delegates from Paris was :

> clear and unmistakable. The French Government . . . . believed that policy in the long run was the best policy, not merely for the Spanish comrades but for the whole working-class movement of Europe and the peace of the world.

Mr. Bevin also had a triumph of daring and vigorous action to report to the Congress. He stated that :

> We despatched a telegram urging a meeting of the Non-Intervention Committee, and I think it can be claimed that the constant pressure of the National Council of Labour on the Government resulted in a speedy meeting of that Committee.

Not content with this, Mr. Bevin went on :

> It is said that the British Government put pressure on the French Government and the French Government on the Russian Government. Well, our delegation to the Foreign Office tested that by every means at their disposal, and I think they are satisfied there is no truth in it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> at all. . . . . That was put to Mr. Eden, and he answered: " . . . . I did not do it, and I have no reason to claim credit for it. It was done by the French, and we readily responded."

In the private meeting of the Internationals, in March, Mr. Bevin had the hardihood to repeat the statement that there was no truth in the allegation that the British Government had put pressure on France, because Mr. Eden denied it! But even Mr. Bevin no longer dared to repeat Sir Walter Citrine's and his own attempt to put the whole responsibility for " non-intervention " on the Blum Government, and admitted that the responsibility was evenly divided between the two. Even this statement was taken strong objection to by the French delegates, who knew better.

Sir Walter Citrine had this to say about the opposition to " non-intervention " in France:

> We had known that in the Popular Front . . . . a campaign was raging against the Government to make it change its position, and we wondered —those of us who are informed on these questions—how it was that the Communist Party of France could demand that the French Government should send munitions to Spain, and that this same Communist Party never raised its voice to ask that one of the greatest Powers in the world, from which it draws its inspiration and its help, should do anything of the kind—a most significant omission.

Now who, hearing that statement, could know that the campaign in opposition to " non-intervention " was being conducted not only by the French Communist Party but also by a large part of the rank and file of the French Socialist Party and some of the French Socialist leaders, and above all, *unitedly and officially by the whole French Trade union movement*, the " *Confédération Générale du Travail*," *with Léon Jouhaux, its General Secretary, at their head?* And yet that was the fact. Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Bevin were not in ignorance of this fact. On the contrary, they knew all about it. But they simply " forgot " to mention it to the Congress.

They did more than that. They ignored another and even more vital fact. On September 9 the *Commission administrative* of the C.G.T., i.e., the General Council of the French trade union movement, passed unanimously, on the initiative of Leon Jouhaux himself, a resolution requesting the French Government to reconsider its policy of neutrality and:

> To take steps to summon as soon as possible the Council of the League of Nations, whose duty it is to proclaim what is the international law that results from the interpretation of the Covenant and to demand of all Governments that they strictly observe the law.
>
> And makes an urgent and fraternal appeal to the British Trades Unions, which are at present meeting in congress, to associate themselves with our demand and to intervene in that sense with the British Government.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This resolution was immediately published in the whole French press, and references to it were made in the British papers.

Twenty-four hours before the *Commission administrative* met to pass this direct, official appeal, on behalf of the whole French trade union movement, to their British comrades then meeting in Congress, there was an official British Labour delegation in Paris, the nature and purpose of which Sir Walter Citrine described :

> We had sent certain comrades over to France—George Hicks, Comrade Dalton of the Labour Party Executive, and one of our officials . . . . We wanted to find out beyond a shadow of doubt what the position of the French Government really was, and the French Socialist Party and our trade union comrades.

Now it is inconceivable that this delegation should have known nothing about the nation-wide campaign being conducted by the whole French trade union movement, and nothing about the appeal to the British T.U.C. passed by the General Council of the French trade union movement.

And yet, incredible as it may seem, not one single solitary word was breathed by either Sir Walter Citrine or Mr. Bevin to the Trade Union Congress about this vitally important resolution. They were both very eloquent in putting the whole responsibility for non-intervention on the unfortunate Blum, and in urging the T.U.C. to support this policy (which the Blum Government detested, and was constrained to adopt only because of the pressure of the British Tory Government) in the name of loyalty to their Socialist comrades. And they represented to the Congress that they were giving all the relevant facts of the situation, based on intimate knowledge and up-to-date information brought back by their delegation to Paris !

Throughout the subsequent months, the declarations of British Labour leaders, and the stand they have taken at international meetings regarding Spain, have swerved very little from those just recorded. At the Edinburgh Conference of the Labour Party, they tried the same tactics again. Here, thanks to general disgust at the threadbare arguments used, to the presence of a powerful body of local Labour Party opinion, and above all to the moving appeals of the delegates of Spanish Labour, they suffered a temporary defeat. They were forced to introduce, at the end of the Conference, a resolution totally opposite in purpose to that they had brought forward three days before. They were obliged to make that memorable promise to " be on the doorstep " of the British Government until the policy which the mass of the British people wanted had triumphed.

But events—and Mr. Bevin's suppressed speech at the international conference in March is only an outstanding example—have shown that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the policy laid down at Plymouth has been pursued in spite of those promises.

The Labour Party and trade union leaders now frequently visit the Foreign Office, and Mr. William Gillies, the head of the International Relations Department of Transport House, maintains close and constant relations with the Foreign Office Press Department. Foreign Office officials have for some months taken to boasting to foreign diplomats that the Government have secured complete national unity on defence and foreign policy, and that trade union leaders and Transport House officials come to them freely for confidential discussions.

And those boasts appear to be not without justification. For example, at the Plymouth T.U.C. Mr. Bevin declared:

> Our whole policy is dependent on the effectiveness of the agreement. If it is ineffective we are under a pledge to call the parties together to reconsider it . . . . If the situation changes, then we must face the situation as it changes.

Since that speech, made eight months ago, it has become abundantly clear that non-intervention has been merely a camouflage for connivance by the British Government at Fascist intervention in Spain. At present there is an Italian expeditionary force engaged in a war of conquest in that country, which there was not when Mr. Bevin made his speech—the proof, if one were wanted, that non-intervention is ineffective. The British Foreign Secretary is known to have informed the French Embassy in London that there was no chance of getting the Italian "volunteers" out, and to have used once again the threat to leave France in the lurch unless the campaign in France around this demand were stopped. Yet it is perfectly well known that Mr. Bevin, backed by the entire General Council and Labour Party Executive, opposed at the March meeting of the Internationals any proposal for a new line of policy. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Labour Party Executive refuses to launch a national campaign to end the criminal fraud of "non-intervention."

It is, in short, a matter of public knowledge that the British Labour leaders throughout the Spanish Civil War—for all their mighty efforts at collections for Spain, resulting up to the end of March in the pitiful sum of £26,430—have in fact held back the British working-class from helping the Spanish people in the latter's battle for British as well as Spanish democracy, British as well as Spanish trade unionism. Even General Franco's "fifth column" concealed in Madrid could do not better than that.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CIVIL LIBERTY

By G. H. C. BING

IN England civil liberty is a question not of legislation, but of administration. Whether or not civil liberty exists in England depends primarily, not upon what laws are passed or repealed, but upon how the law is administered. The structure of the English legal system is such that almost any law can be interpreted and extended in such a way as to affect civil liberty.

Before, therefore, going on to discuss how civil liberty has been affected in the last year by various changes in the law, it is worth while first examining the general mechanism by which civil liberties in England are suppressed. An admirable illustration of this mechanism will be found in the gradual encroachment of political censorship over the cinema. For this attack upon the political content of films has been carried out by the application of provisions originally made by Parliament to protect cinema audiences from the danger of fire.

In 1909, when the cinema was a comparatively new institution, the highly inflammable nature of early films and the tendency of the primitive projectors to set films on fire, led to the passing of an Act of Parliament. Parliament's only idea was to give local County Councils power to see that adequate safety precautions were taken in cinemas where inflammable films were shown. The result of the Act passed with this intention has been, among other things, that a Board of Film Censors responsible only to the cinematograph trade has been set up, and that this Board has now taken upon itself the widest powers of political censorship.

It is instructive to follow out how the Cinematograph Act of 1909 has come to be used for a purpose never suspected by Parliament when passing the Act. The actual section which has led to the setting up of the censorship appears at first sight quite inoccuous. It runs:

> A County Council may grant licences to such persons as they think fit to use premises specified on such terms and conditions and under such restrictions as . . . the Councils may by their respective licences determine.

The first step towards a political censorship was for some County Councils to make it a condition of the licences which they granted for certain buildings to be used as cinemas, that all films shown should first be approved by the County Council. As Parliament had only said in the Act, "under such restrictions" as the Councils might determine in the licences they gave, the Courts held that there was nothing in the Act of Parliament to prevent County Councils only granting licences to those

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cinemas which agreed first to have all the films they intended showing passed by the County Council. But as the Act was directed against fire, it only applied to inflammable films, and soon non-inflammable films came to be made. However, this did not check the censoring power of the County Councils. The Courts decided that if a cinema wished to be licensed for showing inflammable films, the County Councils could impose conditions in the licence, governing the showing of non-inflammable films in the same building, and therefore they could censor all films.

Naturally, these powers of censorship taken on by different County Councils created the greatest confusion in the cinema trade. There was no telling beforehand what films a County Council might approve and what not. One Council might accept one film while another Council censored it. In fact, from a practical point of view, so long as County Councils indulged in unco-ordinated censoring the cinema exhibitors were in an impossible position. Therefore they themselves proposed the solution of the " British Board of Film Censors." The trade itself set up a body of censors sufficiently conservative to have the confidence of every County Council and thus to make it certain that any film passed by them would be accepted by all local authorities. The actual result, of course, is that the British Board of Film Censors prohibits for the whole country any film which might offend the most reactionary County Council. Even if the film is non-inflammable, it cannot be shown in any cinema unless it has a certificate from the Board.

Thus, by an Act of Parliament passed for a totally different purpose, there has been set up a body of persons, not responsible to Parliament, chosen for their conservative views, who control what is to-day one of the most important propaganda mediums in the world.

There are innumerable laws in England to-day which, if put to that purpose, could put an end to all civil liberty. Many of these Acts, like the Cinematograph Act, were intended for an entirely different purpose, but there are on the Statute Book to-day prepared measures, passed in the most reactionary periods of English history for the express purpose of suppressing liberty, which, were they applied impartially, would put an end to all political life as it exists in England.

For example, at the end of the 18th century and again after the Napoleonic Wars when efforts were first being made to organise political parties on a mass basis, a number of Acts of Parliament were passed to prevent the organisation of political parties as we know them to-day. These Acts are still on the Statute Book. The Unlawful Societies Act of 1799 and the Seditious Meetings Act of 1817, both of them still law to-day, specifically prohibit any organisation which possesses independent branches, or which appoints delegates, or which is affiliated to other organisations. It is clear that, were these Acts applied, both the Labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party and the Conservative Party would be illegal organisations, and Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Attlee, as well as everybody else taking part in them, would be liable to a maximum of 14 years' penal servitude.

But though these Acts are not applied to-day, this does not mean that the Government have necessarily given up all idea of using them. Throughout the various revisions of the Statute Book which took place in the last century, these two Acts were carefully preserved. That the Courts still consider them good law was shown when, in 1912, the Warwickshire Miners' Federation tried to put these two Acts to an ingenious use. A member of the Union named Luby, whom they wished to expel, had gone to the Court of Chancery to get an injunction to prohibit the Union from turning him out in a way which, he said, was contrary to the rules. The Union replied by citing the Unlawful Societies and Seditious Meetings Acts and arguing that as they appointed delegates and were affiliated to other bodies they offended against the Acts and were therefore unlawful affairs of which the courts could take no notice. This argument Luby denied, asserting that the two Acts in question were obsolete. But though the judge decided that they did not apply to Trade Unions, he was most emphatic in declaring that the Acts were not obsolete.

> "It has been argued," he said, "that these Acts are to be deemed obsolete insomuch as their enforcement to-day would, as is alleged, lead to manifest injustice and absurdity. Insomuch however, as both these Acts have received comparatively recent recognition and application, while injustice has been guarded against by limiting the right to prosecute for offences under them to the Attorney-General, I find it difficult to say that such of their provisions as have not already been repealed are not still available for the protection of the community against the evils at which they are aimed."

It would be hard to find a better example or a clearer statement of the English method of treating civil liberty.

Whether or not an Act is to be applied, is to be left to the discretion of the Attorney-General, a political official and a member of the Government. It is admitted that if the Acts were applied to all parties equally, it would lead to "manifest injustice and absurdity." This does not, however, prevent the judge from saying that the Acts "are still available for the protection of the community." This means, in short, that he interprets the law as saying that it is open to the Attorney-General to prosecute under an Act which should make all the present political parties illegal, only those political organisations which he, the Attorney-General, considers a danger to the community.

So long as Acts like the Illegal Societies Act and its much used companion, the original Sedition Act of 1797, get on the Statute Book, and so long as Acts like the Cinematograph Act can be stretched in a way

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undreamt of by Parliament when making them, it is natural that the most important encroachments on civil liberty will be made by the application or adaptation of existing legislation and by its further interpretation to fit in with modern circumstances, rather than by the generally unnecessary process of new legislation.

There is, however, one important exception, which should perhaps be dealt with first. *The Public Order Act is probably the greatest single permanent restriction on civil liberty passed by Parliament since the date of the first Reform Bill.* It far surpasses in its danger and in the extent of its possible application the Sedition Act, about which there was far more public outcry.

Its main danger is not, oddly enough, those of its sections which deal with the banning and controlling of processions and the regulation of public meetings, and over which there was most opposition, but the section which passed through the House almost unnoticed, the section which extended the scope of and increased the penalty for "insulting words and behaviour."

Since 1839 it has been an offence in London to use any insulting words or behaviour with intent to cause a breach of the peace, or whereby a breach of the peace might be occasioned. For almost as long, in certain towns, it has been a local offence. For the first time, the offence is now extended to the whole country and the maximum penalty raised from a 40s. fine to three months' imprisonment. What are insulting words or behaviour must, of course, be determined by the stipendiary magistrate, or by the local bench of J.P.s, and it must indeed be clear that what each individual magistrate or justice thinks insulting will depend upon his own political and social experience. There can be no objective test of what is insulting. In the same way, whether or not a particular insult is likely to provoke someone else to commit a breach of the peace must depend upon what is in the individual magistrate's view particularly insulting. Thus it has been held by a London magistrate that to shout "give us bread" is to use insulting words likely to lead to a breach of the peace. A newspaper seller who called out the words on his placard "André executed by the Nazis," a statement which was in fact true, was charged with the same offence; as was a man who affixed a small pacifist poster to a fence near Hendon aerodrome at the time of the Air Display. Persons have been convicted for insulting words and behaviour because they distributed anti-recruiting leaflets at a recruiting march, and because they handed political leaflets attacking the German régime to German visitors coming to England for a football match.

Yet, except for a spirited protest from Mr. D. N. Pritt, the clause in the Public Order Bill raising the penalty for insulting words and behaviour from a 40s. fine to three months' imprisonment, and extending the offence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the whole country, was allowed to go through the House of Commons without opposition. It was supposed, no doubt, by the Labour Party that it would only be applied in dealing with the Fascists, against whom the Bill was ostensibly aimed. No worse mistake could have been made. The first use of this section of the Public Order Act was not to prosecute Blackshirts insulting Jews, but to prosecute miners on strike.

In his report upon the Harworth Colliery Strike, Mr. Kidd, the Secretary of the National Council for Civil Liberties, remarks: "I ascertained from a police official that there are at least some half-dozen cases in which that section of the Public Order Act which deals with the offence of insulting words and behaviour has been used." Thus, within three months of the Public Order Act coming into force, it has been put to a use which the Labour Party, when they welcomed the Bill in the House of Commons, can scarcely have anticipated, and the warning against the clause in the Bill given by the National Council for Civil Liberties has been amply justified. Nothing is more likely to endanger civil liberty than the application to an industrial dispute of a law drafted for an entirely different purpose and depending for its interpretation upon the political and social ideas of the magistrates trying the case.

Whether or not, of course, the Public Order Act is used solely for the purpose for which it was alleged to be intended by Parliament, the suppression of Fascist hooliganism, or whether it is used in industrial disputes, must depend not upon Parliament but upon the police. Indeed the most important single problem of civil liberty in England to-day is to secure the control by democracy of the police. There exists already a sufficient number of Acts of Parliament under which the police can, if they choose, make almost any Left-wing political activity impossible. Whether they apply these powers or not must depend to a large extent on the degree to which the police can be made amenable to public opinion.

Viewed from this angle, the events surrounding the police baton charge at Thurloe Square in March of last year have an added significance. The Commission appointed by the National Council for Civil Liberties and composed of Professor Norman Bentwich, Professor Cornford, Mr. Harrison Barrow, Mr. J. B. Priestley and Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P., a weighty and influential body, reported that the facts of the police baton charge called for "an Official Enquiry into the conduct of the police," and that the account of the incidents in Thurloe Square given by the Home Secretary in the House of Commons could only have been based upon "substantially inaccurate information." Yet, despite this report, no Enquiry was held; the Home Secretary expressing himself as satisfied with the enquiries which had been carried out by the Chief Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another more recent event must shake the faith of the public in the efficacy of those enquiries carried out by the Chief Commissioner, the only method of investigation and redress in case of general allegations made against the police.

An elderly lady, Mrs. Urquhart, was accustomed to sell the *Daily Worker* outside Golders Green Tube Station. One day she was arrested by two detectives and charged under the Highways Act, a hundred year old measure intended by Parliament to prevent horses and carts being left in the streets, and now used largely for prosecuting persons holding political meetings on the highway. She was acquitted, and certain grave irregularities in the conduct of the police led her solicitor, Mr. Thompson, to write to Scotland Yard. He received a reply that the Commissioner had carried out an enquiry into his allegations and had found that the police had acted in a perfectly correct fashion. Mr. Thompson then threatened to bring proceedings against the officers concerned. Whereupon the Commissioner replied that he had caused further enquiries to be made, which, apparently, resulted in his arriving at diametrically opposed conclusions, for he now admitted that the police had acted wrongfully, and offered Mrs. Urquhart a substantial pecuniary compensation.

Taken together, the Thurloe Square affair and the Urquhart case illustrate admirably the practical difficulties in securing public control over the police, even in London where the Commissioner is directly responsible to the Home Secretary, who is in his turn responsible to Parliament.

Outside London the position is even worse, for there the police forces are not responsible to Parliament, but in the boroughs to local Watch Committees, and in the counties to Standing Joint Committees, where the Justices of the Peace have equal representation with the nominees of the County Council. Thus, though it is ultimately a political question that if the Public Order Act should be used against miners on strike when the Home Secretary indicated in the House of Commons that it would only be used against Fascist hooliganism, this is not a matter which can be raised politically. The House of Commons cannot discuss the conduct of the Nottinghamshire police, this is a matter solely for the Nottinghamshire Standing Joint Committee.

Thus the struggle for civil liberties is something much broader than a mere Parliamentary battle. Those who would preserve what are regarded as the traditional civil liberties must fight on all fronts. The struggle for civil liberty is the struggle to secure democratic control not only over the making of law, but also over its administration.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"LEFT" SOCIALISM & THE PEOPLE'S FRONT

Notes on the I.L.P. Conference

By J. R. CAMPBELL

> We frequently observe the characteristic phenomenon that not a few of the Left Socialists who have become disillusioned with the Social Democrats' policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and are moving away from reformism, are frequently inclined to go to the other extreme and become the victims of sectarianism and Leftist excesses. They make the mistake of identifying the policy of the People's Front with the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and demand "a pure working class policy," declaring that the joint struggles of the working class and the democratic sections of the lower middle classes, the peasantry and intelligentsia against Fascism constitutes a retreat from the position of the class struggle.

THE above remarks of Comrade Dimitrov seem as if they were written with the Easter Conference of the I.L.P. in mind. On the relations of the United Front of the working class to a Popular Front, on the problems of the Spanish people's struggle, on the rôle of the working class in the struggle against war, the I.L.P. was more than self-conscious of its "Leftness." Running through all the speeches one could almost detect the thought "see how Left we are compared with the Communist Party."

The writer of this article believes that the I.L.P. gave quite wrong answers to the questions that confronted it, that the Left phraseology that was used so lavishly during the Conference, simply concealed a failure to grapple with the problem of what the working class must do in the present phase of the class struggle. The resolutions of the Conference were not a guide to action but a guide to abstract criticism—of the Communist Party.

The crying defect of the resolutions of the I.L.P. conference is that they proceed from general principles instead of from a concrete many-sided analysis of the existing situation.

Here, for example, are a number of basic quotations from the Conference resolutions:

> The I.L.P. recognises that Fascism is capitalism in its extreme form, and that so long as capitalism continues, the possessing and privileged

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class will increasingly resort to the methods of Fascism in order to destroy the opportunity of the working class to use democratic liberties in the struggle against capitalism.

The I.L.P. deplores the tendency of some sections of the working class movement to apply to the fight against Fascism methods which create the illusion that the menace of Fascism is separate and distinct from the general economic subjection of the workers by capitalism and consequently that the fight against Fascism can be isolated from the day to day struggle of the workers.

The danger that working class forces will be divided by this propaganda emphasises the necessity to make it clear that capitalist democracy is not the alternative to Fascism and that the working class struggle for improved conditions, aiming at Workers' Power and Socialism, is the basis on which both the failure of capitalist democracy and the menace of Fascism must be met.

This recognition of the nature of Fascism while it requires the sternest resistance to all limitations of civil rights, involves the rejection of policies which aim at lining up the Working Class movement with the " democratic " capitalist states against the Fascist capitalist states or with " democratic " capitalist elements on a programme of democracy within capitalism. (*Resolution on the " Fight Against Fascism."*)

The I.L.P. is therefore opposed to the tactic of the Popular Front which aims at combining the working-class forces with the "democratic" elements within the capitalist Parties in opposition to Fascism and reaction. This tactic ignores the fact that Fascism and reaction are inseparable from capitalism and can only be defeated by the overthrow of capitalism. It necessitates disastrous compromises, as shown by the experiences of Spain and France, which provide favourable opportunities for Fascism. It involves a suspension of the struggle for Workers' Power and Socialism in favour of the defence of capitalist democracy. (*Resolution on the " Popular Front."*)

In the above formulations and in the speeches at the Conference the fact that Fascism is rooted in capitalism was stressed. This is true. Fascism is the form of political reaction which grows on the soil of decaying monopoly capitalism. The menace of Fascism can therefore only definitely be liquidated when monopoly capitalism has been overthrown. But these generalisations are not a sufficiently complete guide to the daily conduct of the struggle of the working class. Such political action is only possible on a basis of the evaluation of all social forces and not on the basis of a generalisation, however correct.

It is true that Fascist tendencies are everywhere developing amongst the capitalist class. But the growth of Fascist tendencies amongst the capitalist class is one thing and their expression in a powerful mass movement is another. Even if we grant that the growth of Fascist moods amongst the capitalist class is inevitable, it is not inevitable that millions of non-capitalists (petty bourgeoisie and backward workers) shall be won for Fascism. Our concrete task, on the basis of a sober examination

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the situation, is to pursue a policy that wins those elements as supporters or allies of the Labour movement in the struggle against Fascism, and in most countries the working-class movement must be united itself before it can influence other sections of the people.

The capitalist class are under no illusions as to the danger of working-class unity. The whole vast propaganda machine at their disposal is used to prevent working-class unity as long as possible. When this fails their aim is to isolate the working-class from other sections of the people. In a whole series of countries a united working-class would still be in a minority. It is therefore necessary to win the intermediate strata of the population for the anti-Fascist struggle. For the working class to neglect the petty bourgeoisie or to pursue a policy of " come to us on our terms " is to pursue an idiotic tactic of self isolation. But if the workers desire to co-operate with the petty bourgeoisie they must fight for the demands of the petty bourgeoisie alongside their own, co-operate with petty bourgeois organisations, and allow those organisations a voice in the conduct of the struggle. And that is the People's Front.

The I.L.P. and Spain

How unreal many of the criticisms of the People's Front are, is seen in relation to the Spanish struggle. Here the Fascist movement, supported by Hitler and Mussolini, is menacing the majority of the Spanish people. Not only workers' organisations are in peril, but all democratic organisation, all modern culture. If Franco wins there will be a reactionary régime in Spain compared with which the worst of Nazi barbarism will seem like " sweetness and light." And for the simple reason that Franco is heavily supported by the Fascist powers, his defeat will not be easy. Surely the sensible thing is to unite every element hostile to Franco in the struggle to defeat him, and the common basis on which to unite is the defence of the existing democratic governments, in which the organisations of the workers have preponderant influence.

But this which appears to us as stark commonsense, is a crime and a betrayal in the sight of the I.L.P., which raises a hysterical clamour to the effect that capitalist democracy is hardly worth defending, that non-working-class democrats are unreliable allies, that the real issue is Socialism versus Fascism.

All those high sounding phrases can be expressed more concretely in the propositions : (1) Franco can be defeated by class-conscious Socialists alone, without the assistance of the peasantry or the town petty bourgeoisie; (2) Or while we need those elements, we are prepared to accept their co-operation, but only on the basis of our programme. When one remembers the fact that the working-class is in a minority in Spain, that the peasantry had not the revolutionary tradition that it had in Russia, the folly of these tactics is more than evident.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To justify this ridiculous standpoint sham Socialist arguments are employed. We are told that if Fascism grows on the soil of capitalism it can only be finally defeated by the abolition of capitalism. This is true, but unhelpful. For the problem in France and Spain, the problem that is arising elsewhere, is what to do in countries where the majority of the people is anti-Fascist but not yet Socialist, in order to defeat the immediate Fascist attack, and in the process win masses of non-Socialists to see the necessity of overthrowing the capitalist system itself.

What the opposition to the People's Front amounts to is this. That it is wrong for Socialists to combine with non-Socialist democrats in a struggle against a Fascist rebellion which threatens both. We know of no conceivable argument in favour of this policy, which is simply a result of applying formal logic to premises which ignore the real situation confronting us to-day.

Another popular argument of the I.L.P. Conference was that the Popular Front meant the abandonment of class struggle for class co-operation. Really one would have thought that the civil war which the Spanish Popular Front is engaged in at this moment is a sufficiently acute form of class struggle to suit even the most energetic revolutionary. It should be noted that while " Left " Socialists are arguing that the People's Front is dangerous because it stifles class struggle, the Right Wing is shrieking that the People's Front by intensifying the class struggle leads directly to Civil War.

So far from stifling the class struggle, the development of the Popular Front has altered the relation of class forces in favour of the working class. In less than a year it took Cabellero from jail and made him Prime Minister of Spain. It was not because the development of the Popular Front was stifling the class struggle, it was because it was gradually stifling reaction that the generals resorted to arms.

Here, however, an interesting point arises. One of the charges against the Left Republican Government that arose out of the election in February, 1936, and that was supported by the People's Front organisations in Spain, was that it should have immediately given Morocco its independence and have cleared every pro-Fascist officer out of the army. Here again is a refusal to consider the concrete conditions. Are not some of our extremely " Left " comrades embracing the fundamentally Right Wing proposition that a parliamentary majority gives complete control of the Army and Navy. Remember that in the first days of the new Government, the working-class movement was just beginning to re-emerge from illegality. The Workers' Militia had not been formed. An immediate attempt to dismiss all Fascist officers could have precipitated a military rising at a time when the workers were less prepared than in July, and when, remember, there was still a Right Wing Government in France.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Surely it was essential to allow the workers' organisations time to re-form and to proceed by way of undermining the extreme reactionaries. The Left Republican Government was undoubtedly dilatory in carrying out this line, but to talk as if it was a Government which had full control of the army and could cleanse it without difficulties—is to betray a faith in the efficacy of Parliamentary majorities understandable amongst Right Wingers but strange when it is found amongst " Lefts."

Surely, one must look at the Popular Front movement in its growth. To speak of a development that has brought the workers' organisations in Spain out of illegality into the position of power they hold to-day, as involving a betrayal of the class struggle, can only be explained on the ground that certain " Left " Socialists are harbouring the strange delusion that the class struggle means the working class versus the rest of society. This conception is ludicrous. The class struggle can best be waged seriously when the working class isolates the capitalist class by winning large sections of the petty bourgeoisie to the side of the workers, and that is the object of the People's Front.

One of the most revealing incidents of the Conference was when Jennie Lee said " there might come a time when we would be glad even of the existence of a Popular Front Government. Loud cries of ' no ' roused her to a slashing attack on those whose only care was the saving of their own souls." (*New Leader*, April 2.) In other words, the shouters prefer the risks of a Fascist victory to an alliance with non-proletarian elements to resist Fascism. This is the negation of the class struggle and of all serious politics.

Throughout the discussion on the People's Front it is assumed that this is an alliance of a static character. This is entirely wrong. The People's Front is an alliance between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie, but the specific weight of the working-class movement in the alliance can change in the process of the development of the struggle. Indeed, it is the duty of the working-class parties to see that it does change. Before the Fascist rising in Spain there was a Popular Front. To-day, there is a Popular Front, but the influence of the working-class in this Popular Front has increased enormously and the outlook of large numbers of the middle class allies of the workers has undergone a significant change. The People's Front must be regarded, therefore, not only as a form of co-operation between the working-class and the democratic middle class for the purpose of defeating fascism, but also as a form of co-operation in which the workers, in the course of the struggle, transform the outlook of their allies. It may be that in certain countries a specific Government arising out of the People's Front will prove unequal to its task and will collapse. It is true that opportunist mistakes have been committed in the building up of the People's Front. This is liable

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to happen in all forms of alliances for immediate purposes. It could take place, for example, just as well within the framework of a United Front alliance. It may be that in some countries the original form of the People's Front alliance will break and the alliance will have to be reconstructed on a new basis. All forms of alliances in which a revolutionary party co-operates with non-revolutionary elements need constant vigilance, but that is no argument against the alliance, it is simply a proof that real life is often more complicated than Left socialist schemes. What is essential to the People's Front is that the working-class, having achieved the united front itself, shall, in accordance with the peculiar conditions of the country in which it is operating, seek to win the petty bourgeoisie and to isolate the capitalist class. No one suggests that the fight against fascism can be isolated from the general day-to-day struggle of the workers, as is asserted by the I.L.P. Resolution on the " Fight Against Fascism." On the contrary, the People's Front is built on the basis of a programme of the day-to-day demands of the working-class and the petty-bourgeoisie.

From the wrong conception that the People's Front policy is one of class co-operation, the Left socialists associated with the I.L.P. hope to break up also the Popular Front in Spain. All the activities of the P.O.U.M. are devoted to the policy of breaking-up the democratic alliance and pursuing a policy of " the workers alone " against Franco. That this is precisely what the agents of Franco are striving for, namely, to drive a wedge between the workers and the petty bourgeoisie, and a wedge between the Anarchists and the Communists, is lost upon them.

This can be quite clearly seen in the attitude of the P.O.U.M. towards the problem of creating a united army in Spain. Mr. Bob Edwards, in an article in the *New Leader*, says :

> It is stated that the P.O.U.M. are opposed to a unified command amongst the Spanish military forces. This statement is completely untrue, for the past six months the P.O.U.M. have been advocating the unification of the army forces.

The answer to this is that the P.O.U.M. is against the proposals for a unified army which are being put forward by the Government of the Republic and the Government of Catalonia. They are in favour of a workers' army whose leadership is selected by a Soldiers' Congress, but which is not under the control of the existing governments in Spain. That is concretely opposing a unified army, for there is no likelihood of the P.O.U.M. proposals being adopted.

Bob Edwards further complains that the Communist Party is putting forward the following slogans :

> " A People's Army," " A Neutral Army," " A Non-political Army," " A unified command under one Flag " (The Republican Flag), " Save the Republic." All of these slogans are acceptable to the reformist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> elements and parties in Spain, thus enabling the Communists to build up a Popular Front of the non-working-class and non-revolutionary elements, a Popular Front which is being used to isolate both the P.O.U.M. and the C.N.T.

In other words, in the middle of the civil war it is regarded as a crime for the working-class to try and win non-working-class democrats as its allies. A great deal is made about the phrase "A Neutral Army." Bob Edwards knows perfectly well that this means not neutrality with regard to Franco or Fascism, but that the army will be neutral as between the various political parties of the alliance. The alternative to that is the P.O.U.M. army, an Anarchist army, a Communist army, a Left Republican army, in short the continuation of the chaos existing on the Aragon Front at the present time.

What is bad about the alliance with non-Fascist democrats to fight Fascism, we are not told ; we are left to assume that the Left socialists consider that it is better to be defeated under the socialist banner than to win under the democratic banner. People who are not victims of Left phrases will, however, choose the latter, because in the struggle of the democratic alliance the workers will have the opportunity to transform their allies and that will prove to be the quickest way to a socialist victory in Spain after all.

Another complaint of Bob Edwards is as follows : " the winding-up of the workers' guard patrol and the substitution of what is called an internal security force." Here again we have the same situation as in the army. Has every political party to have its own private police or is there to be one police in Catalonia controlled by the Government in which the working-class organisations have the control ? Surely the latter. Is it not clear that the gravest injury can be done to the united struggle of the Spanish people against Fascism by arbitrary actions of workers' patrols associated with particular political parties or Trades Unions ?

The struggle in Catalonia is around the question therefore as to whether there shall be one government or a 100 little governments. It is precisely here, where the P.O.U.M. influence is strongest, that there exists a ruinous situation which if repeated in the rest of Spain would ensure victory to Franco. Look at the positive policy of the P.O.U.M. It is comprised of (1) resistance to the formation of a united army now ; (2) the break-up of the Popular Front ; (3) The driving of a wedge between the Communist Party and the Anarchists. There you have a concrete example of where the rejection of the People's Front leads.

The I.L.P. and War

The struggle against war also occupied a considerable amount of attention at the I.L.P. Conference. Now every Socialist knows that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the war crisis is an expression of the capitalist system. The whole problem, however, is how to get the masses to see the necessity of attacking capitalism as the cause of war. This cannot be done by propaganda alone, but through the experience which the workers acquire in the struggle in defence of peace and democracy. Because the capitalist system is attacking peace and democracy, these are the issues to seize upon in order to commence a struggle that can be developed against the capitalist system itself.

From the point of view of pure propaganda it is necessary to stress that war is an expression of the capitalist system, that every government so far as it upholds capitalism is supporting a system which generates war, but from the point of view of the every day practical activities of the workers it is not a matter of indifference what policy a given capitalist government is pursuing. It is not a matter of indifference that the British Government, operating within the framework of capitalism, is pursuing a different policy to the French Government, also operating within the framework of capitalism. It is clear that the British Government is pursuing a policy of encouraging the Fascist states in Europe and it is clear that we have to struggle against the day-to-day foreign policy of the Government just as we struggle against its day-to-day domestic policy. We do not say " unemployment cuts are inevitable, therefore we must attack the capitalist system." We fight against every attempt to cut unemployment relief, link our fight up with our fundamental propaganda, and seek to direct the workers towards attacking the Government itself. So with our struggle for peace. We do not accept the pro-Fascist policy of the Government, we fight for a different foreign policy and direct that fight towards the resignation of the Government.

Not even Left socialists doubt that we should make demands on the Government in relation to its Spanish policy, but when it comes to general questions of foreign policy they believe that by making demands on the Government we are slipping into opportunism.

A real struggle against war does not consist merely in (1) demonstrating that the cause of war is capitalism ; (2) opposing the Arms policy of the Government and opposing the League of Nations. Yet this is all the I.L.P. resolution on war does. It tells us that war arises out of the capitalist system, it advises us what to do in various types of war, colonial, inter-imperialist, imperialist versus the Soviet Union, but it does not tell us what to do now.

A real answer to the war danger means, however, opposing the concrete foreign policy of the Government with one more likely to secure the maintenance of peace, developing the movement around the fight for that policy, and on this basis striving for a change of Government. Unless we do that our opposition is wordy and sterile.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The I.L.P. and the Soviet Union

In the debate on this resolution there was the usual reference to Soviet Russia's foreign policy, which was described as betraying the working class and stifling the world revolution.

It is assumed that this is some new and monstrous policy invented by Stalin, but right from the commencement of the Bolshevik Revolution the Soviet Union sought to take advantage of the conflicts between the Imperialist states. Indeed, it was precisely because such differences existed in an acute form that it was possible for the Soviet Union to defeat intervention and to prevent the building up of a united front of imperialist states. So far from it being wrong to take advantage of the fact that some capitalist countries do not want an immediate war, it is our bounden duty to do so, and any positive peace policy must have as its objective a fight to force the British Government to associate with those countries who do not want an immediate war.

The same considerations applied to the Soviet Union diplomacy in relation to Spain. It is assumed that immediately the Spanish civil war broke out the Soviet Union should have rushed to assist the Spanish people, ahead of Hitler and Mussolini, with arms and with men.

It is clearly the duty of the working-class states to render all possible assistance to the workers struggling in other countries in the world, but to do that it is necessary to consider what is best in any concrete situation. It is no part of the duty of the Government that is seriously concerned with defending peace, to rush in and " damn the consequences."

Right from the start, Franco and his allies have sought to isolate the Spanish people by claiming that their war was not against democracy but against the Reds. The Soviet Union was correct in pursuing a course that made is impossible for the Fascists to maintain their myth of " Red intervention," and so hindered the formation of a capitalist united front directed against the Spanish people. It is folly to take the view when one is dealing with Spain that all capitalist governments are the same. If by capitalist governments we mean governments working within the framework of the capitalist system, then the governments of both France and Mexico are capitalist governments. It would be a very foolish person who would suggest, however, that their attitude in the struggle of the Spanish people has been the same as the governments of Hitler and Mussolini.

The whole basis of this abstract Left policy is a refusal to recognise that Fascist states are the chief instigators of war, with the British Government as their helper. Consequently, there was no suggestion at the I.L.P. Conference for any concrete fight against the policy of the British Government as the basis for its overthrow. On the contrary, the war resolution

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

involves an avoidance of the daily fight, an avoidance of the attempt to mobilise the peace forces of Britain against the National Government.

Because the existence of the Fascist bloc and the rôle of the British Government is ignored, some strange things have crept into the I.L.P. resolution. Here, for example, is a prescription for a war situation:

> In the event of a war between two capitalist countries, or two groups of capitalist countries (even if a Workers' State is part of one of the groups), it will be the duty of the British working class to concentrate on the task of overthrowing the British capitalist Government and to co-operate with the workers of other countries in overthrowing their capitalist governments.

Two things can be said about this. First, there is no indication on the part of the British Government that they might co-operate with the Soviet Union against Fascist Governments, as this paragraph suggests they might. If the British Government was prepared to do so, this would be a most important factor in maintaining peace. (2) The one conceivable situation where a British Government would be found co-operating with the Soviet Union would be if a Labour Government was returned to office in this country. Now such a Labour Government would be a Government mainly engaged in administering the capitalist system, i.e., a capitalist government, and yet the prescription of the I.L.P. is that in the event of a Labour government line-up with the Soviet Union in a struggle against the Fascist powers, it would be the duty of the British working class right from the commencement to sabotage the war plans of this government and to do all it could to secure its overthrow. It is obvious that no line can be conceived more calculated to help a Fascist victory on a world scale.

Lastly, we would refer to the resolution on a new International. It is suggested that the Communist International has ceased to be a revolutionary International and that the Communists are now pursuing a policy of class co-operation.

This is said at the moment when Parties of the Communist International are putting forth an unprecedented effort in connection with the struggle in Spain. We will not engage in any ludicrous comparison between what has been done by the splinter parties associated with the I.L.P. and what has been done by the Communist International. We are prepared to have an examination as to what has been done by all the parties associated with the I.L.P. as against what has been done by the Communist Party of Great Britain, and we are satisfied that our Party has done as much as all those splinter parties together. And yet the only justification offered by those parties for the new International is that the Communist Parties have ceased to be revolutionary and are failing to develop the struggle. In the British Labour movement at the present time an unprecedented concentration of reaction is taking

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place, mainly directed against the Communist Party, the same is taking place in every other country in Europe, and yet a few feeble ineffective parties are loudly boasting that the Communist International has failed and that they alone can provide the basis for a new International.

Unfortunately, the parties which are propagating the idea of this new International propose to hold a Congress in Barcelona. Such a Congress will be nothing more nor less than a demonstration of splinter parties in favour of the P.O.U.M., which is striving might and main to prevent the unification of the Spanish struggle under one government, one army and one economic plan. Such a Congress is not only a stimulus to division in the international working-class movement but is a stimulus to division in Spain and acts as an aid to counter-revolution in that country.

The only useful resolution passed by the I.L.P. was, in our opinion, the resolution on the Unity Campaign (although the resolution on the Popular Front, envisaging as it does the possibility of the formation of a united revolutionary party outside the Labour Party machinery, is undoubtedly hostile to the underlying idea of the Unity Campaign). Even participation in the Unity Campaign, however, will not save the Independent Labour Party from complete sterility unless the policy of resounding revolutionary phrases is abandoned and a real socialist policy, based on a comprehensive analysis of the actual class forces in Britain and their tendencies, takes its place.

We hope that the Unity Campaign may have an effect in this direction, a little revolutionary practice is often an effective cure for a bad attack of revolutionary phrase-mongering.

[*Note.—Beginning with the June issue, the* LABOUR MONTHLY *will publish a further series of the specially selected Letters of Lenin.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FASCISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

By REGINALD BRIDGEMAN

DESPITE the period of prosperity in South African economy which began four years ago, assisted by the huge gold yield, the country is not without its difficulties, and the financial magnates are reminding each other of the inexorable economic law under which fat years are inevitably followed by lean.

Fascism is in process of becoming solidly established in the Union, and among the Resolutions submitted to the Annual Conference of the South African Trades and Labour Council at Port Elizabeth in March was one asking all affiliated bodies to warn their membership against the Greyshirts and other Fascist organisations.

Out of a white population of just under 2,000,000 in the Union of South Africa there are roughly 400,000 "poor whites." To control these the South African Government has established labour camps, the dole, and training centres, where unemployed workers are militarised at a relatively small cost and enrolled by the Minister of Defence, Mr. Pirow, in the Special Service Battalions, to be used if necessary against the workers in industrial disputes or for "defence" against the African inhabitants. These Special Service Battalions are in fact 1s. per day storm troop organisations which are available for the establishment of a Nazi-Fascist dictatorship in South Africa.

On April 15, the Minister of Defence announced that a physical education campaign throughout the country is to be undertaken.

The defence plan, which was announced in the House of Assembly a year ago, provided for the addition of 1,000 new air pilots in five years, and 3,000 mechanics, and the formation out of the civil aircraft in the Union of 12 squadrons of high-speed bombers, with five machines in each squadron.

According to "The South African Worker," South Africa is being militarised from top to bottom. A Military Board has been appointed and is taking a census of all factories—how quickly they can be converted to produce war materials. With the aid of British imperialism the Government has purchased 100 Hartebeest aeroplanes below cost price, and a flight of British fighters of the latest design has also been ordered. Every aeroplane serving the civil transport lines in South Africa to-day can be converted within 24 hours into a military war machine. To provide the country with sufficient steel for armament manufacturing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purposes in the event of overseas supplies being interrupted, a State Steel works has been built, and the Defence Department has arranged for the building of an ammunition factory at Pretoria.

In order to impress the efficiency of the British Navy upon the Union Parliament, a party of its members was recently conducted on board H.M.S. Amphion to witness a demonstration target practice. Since then the Government of South Africa has agreed that the important harbour at Simon's Town shall continue to be available for the British Navy—a base which might be indispensable if the Mediterranean were closed and the Cape route to India revived.

Wages in South Africa are no longer fixed by employers or workers, or even by the Wage Board, but by the Minister of Labour.

By an amendment to the Customs Tariff, for which the Minister of the Interior, Mr. J. H. Hofmeyer, was responsible, Customs officials are empowered to seize books and newspapers imported from overseas. The people's reading is thus controlled.

Anti-semitism is developing. There are in South Africa 95,000 Jews ; in 1936, 2,500 Jewish immigrants came from Germany ; 2,000 immigrants, mostly Jews, who landed recently in South Africa with temporary permits have been ordered to leave, and, under the Aliens Act which was hurriedly passed by the South African Parliament, a Board has been set up which is intended to keep out all immigrants from Eastern Europe.

Attempts are being made to split the South African Trade Union movement on racial lines by setting up Afrikaans Trade Unions, which are anti-Jewish and anti-Communist. In the Gold Mines an Afrikaans Union (the Mynwerkersbond) has been started as a rival to the Mineworkers' Union of South Africa. One Dutch lady gave £10,000 to this racialist movement, of which Dr. Hertzog, the Prime Minister's son, is a leader. It is supported by the Malan wing of the Nationalists.

While the South African Trades and Labour Council is taking a strong stand against this attempt to split the workers, the Chamber of Mines, representing important British mining interests, has announced that from June 1 it will adopt a " closed shop " principle by recognising the Mineworkers' Union of South Africa. This step is no doubt prompted by the desire to check the influence of the Malan extreme Nationalist Afrikaans, who are sympathetic to Nazi intrigues in Africa generally, but as a price of recognition by the Chamber of Mines the reformist leadership of the Mineworkers' Union has undertaken that its members : " shall not during working hours or when on mine premises engage actively in a trade union sense or otherwise in a manner in the opinion of the managers calculated to cause unrest or undermine discipline," which means that this union is on the way to becoming a company union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germans in S.W. Africa

On April 2, the Union Government, because of the character of German Nazi intrigues in S.W. Africa, issued a Proclamation excluding aliens in S.W. Africa from public affairs and prohibiting their membership of political organisations. This step was not taken, however, in any spirit of hostility to Germany, but only because the Germans in S.W. Africa, instead of co-operating with the Government, which is sympathetic to them and to their desire to see German the language of the country, called on the German Government to take over the territory. In his reply to a protest by the German Government, General Hertzog has once more shown the warmth of his Government's feelings towards Germany, reiterating their profound desire to promote the peaceful progress of S.W. Africa, and regretting that the Reich should have regarded the Proclamation as a combative measure against the German inhabitants of the territory. He repeated the Union Government's desire for friendly relations with the German community in S.W. Africa and hinted clearly that the Administrator of S.W. Africa will not use his powers under the Proclamation if German nationals in the territory voluntarily cease their interference.

This reply has been favourably received in Germany, and the manner in which Dr. Malan criticised the Proclamation proved that the German Fascists had not been in any way deserted.

It suited the British Government and the British imperialist press to invest this incident with more importance than it actually possessed ; this was because of the whole question in South Africa, which recently led a competent observer to write as follows :

> I am more and more convinced that at a convenient moment the Union of South Africa would be handed over to Hitler Germany even by the so-called Imperialists, Smuts & Co. Of course the open antagonism to Britain, to the Jews, to the Communists, is carried on by Dr. Malan, the Dutch Opposition leader, but he has sympathisers in the Government camp, notably Pirow, Minister of Railways, Harbours and Defence. Of course, if England goes fascist nothing much will happen, but if Britain became Socialist or even brought in a government of the United Front, then the pro-fascist crowd here would show their teeth and would use the weapons, now being supplied by Britain, against a really democratic government. They would declare their independence, which would in effect, mean inviting Hitler to take the country.

The Government of the Union of South Africa has, of course, made it quite clear, by public declarations, that it regards its Mandate over S.W. Africa as co-equal with its right to the territory of S. Africa.

The Africans

The forthcoming elections in South Africa will be held under the Native Representation Act, 1936, which established the political segre-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gation of Black and White as the basic principle of the Native policy of the Union Government. This entirely reactionary measure abolished, in the Cape Province of South Africa, the franchise which had been enjoyed for 75 years by the limited number of the native population which was able to pass the stringent qualifications laid down in the Act of Union, viz., that voters must be able to write their name, address and occupation, and own property worth £75 or receive a salary or wages of not less than £50 a year.

It is true that the Africans retain their right to vote, but only on a separate electoral roll for three white representatives in the House of Assembly. At the same time a large number of Africans in the Provinces other than the Cape Province (Transvaal, Orange Free State and Natal) have the right of electing their own representatives to Advisory Councils for the Negro peoples, but as these Councils possess only advisory and not executive powers they are not of much use to the Africans. For the 32 elective seats in the Senate the Africans only have indirect representation. The Native Advisory Councils and the totally inadequate European representation in the Senate cannot bring about reforms which would be of real benefit to Africans, who number 6,000,000, but the coming elections are being made the basis for agitation amongst the Bantus in their struggle against the ruthless offensive of British finance capital and Afrikaaner landlordism.

The Europeans whom the Africans will have the opportunity of supporting in the Senate Election will be expected to support the programme of the African Convention.

Mr. H. M. Basner, a Solicitor, is receiving African support in the Senate Election and the main points of his election manifesto are: (1) Satisfying the land hunger, because there is sufficient unused land in South Africa to give each native peasant as much land as he can work; (2) Equality of franchise; (3) Abolition of taxes (Poll Tax, Hut Tax, etc.) specially imposed on Africans; (4) Abolition of all Pass Laws; (5) Abolition of the Masters and Servants Act and of the colour bar in industry, trade or commerce; (6) Free primary education for all; (7) Equal democratic rights for all races in South Africa.

A campaign is in progress in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State for the nomination of Mr. Edwin Thabo Mofutsanyana, Secretary of the Communist Party of South Africa and Transvaal Provincial Secretary of the All African Convention, as a candidate for the Native Representation Council.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

FACING THE FACTS.

Lenin: Selected Works. Vol. VII. After the Seizure of Power. 1917-18. (Lawrence and Wishart.) 5s.

IMMEDIATELY after the seizure of power in Russia in 1917, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party fought a decisive battle against the political attitude and outlook which in our own day has found its last level in the counter-revolutionary activities of Trotskyism and which, under the Trotskyist banner, seeks to sow disruption in the working-class movement. It is only necessary to refer to the nefarious activity of the P.O.U.M. in Spain—to say nothing of the last Moscow Trial or of Trotsky's personal association with the most scoundrelly and reactionary elements in Mexican society—to emphasise the character of the menace with which our movement has to deal.

The present volume of Lenin's Selected Works therefore appears at a most opportune moment. Not only has it the value of reprinting Lenin's most important writings on the State and the dictatorship of the proletariat (here are " The State and Revolution " and " The Proletarian Revolution ") ; of exceptional importance are the selections from Lenin's speeches and reports of the first six months of 1918. This material has—with the exception of one rare pamphlet—not hitherto been available to the English reader. What it does is to show with brilliant clarity what Marxism-Leninism *in practice* implies ; and by the same token exhibits the canker at the core of the " revolutionary " ideologies which end in the counter-revolutionary swamp of Trotskyism.

The issue is a simple one. Leninism faces the facts. Trotskyism—including all forms of " ultra-Left " sham revolutionism that end in Trotskyism—never faces the facts. It prefers the intoxication of the revolutionary phrase. " Marxism (as Lenin himself said) demands from us the most accurate, the most objectively verifiable, analysis of the relationship of class forces and the concrete peculiarities of every historical moment," in order to have the only sound guide to action.

In the critical opening months of 1918 the young Soviet Republic had at all costs to get peace, and, plunged as it was in the depths of economic ruin, to tackle the rebuilding of economic life on a basis that would ensure the possibility of development towards Socialism. The main facts of the signature of the humiliating Brest-Litovsk peace with imperialist Germany are sufficiently known. There were many in the Bolshevik Party who opposed the peace ; others, like Trotsky with his slogan of " neither war nor peace," adopted a conciliatory line. Chief of the opponents of the Brest-Litovsk peace were the group who called themselves " Left " Communists. Their leaders included Piatakov, Radek, Bukharin (names that are a programme !).

What the present volume shows is the little-known fact that the opposition of this group to Lenin's leadership and line went far beyond the question of the treaty with Germany. On the whole vital question of the immediate political and economic tasks of the Revolution they called the Leninist line of alliance between the working class and the poor peasants, of developing State capitalism as a progressive step under Russian conditions, a " diversion " . . . . into the channels of petty-bourgeois policy." Is not this language one with the current cant of the Spanish Trotskyists (for example) about the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" petty-bourgeois reformist " Popular Front Government, about the " reformism " of the Spanish Communists, etc., etc. ?

It was noteworthy that this " Left " Opposition, just like their present-day spiritual heirs, loudly proclaimed themselves to be the only " proletarian " Communists, boasted that their policy alone bore the " proletarian " hall-mark. Patiently Lenin pointed out in speech after speech that, on the contrary, this group consistently failed to face the facts, consistently deceived themselves with revolutionary phrase-mongering. Therefore, he emphasised, far from being proletarian, their mentality was quintessentially petty-bourgeois. These people, he said, adopted " the point of view of the typical declassed petty-bourgeois intellectual, with the mental outlook of an aristocrat, who considers that . . . . the brandishing of a cardboard sword is ' activity.' " Does not that stroke go home for all such elements—past, present and future ?

" The social source of these types," Lenin declared, " is the small master who is driven to frenzy by the horrors of war, the sudden ruin, the unprecedented tortures of starvation and destruction, who hysterically rushes from place to place seeking salvation, places his confidence in the proletariat and supports it at one moment and falls into fits of despair at another." " The misfortune of these sorry ' revolutionaries,' " he stressed, " is that they lack stamina in the difficult moments of a difficult transition."

In those supremely difficult days Lenin saw clear and straight. " Yet," he said, " Russia could win, if she will but shake off all despondency and empty phrases," realising that she must firmly tread the revolutionary path upon which she had entered after November, 1917. " To go forward on this path, undiscouraged by defeat ; to lay gradually the sound foundation of a Socialist society ; to work unceasingly for the creation of discipline and self-discipline, for the strengthening everywhere of organisation, order and business-like methods ; the harmonious co-operation of all the forces of the nation ; a general accounting and control of production and distribution ; that way lies power, alike in a military and in a Socialist sense."

Those lines were written by Lenin in March, 1918, under the heading " The Chief Task of our Times " (I regret that they are not given in the present selection). No one can deny, facing the existence of the mighty Soviet Union to-day, that life has borne them out to the letter. If Trotskyism's precursors had had their way it would have been impossible to write that sentence.

ALLEN HUTT.

DURHAM MINERS INSPECT SOVIET MINES.

A Report by Durham Miners on their visit to the U.S.S.R. Published by the Durham Miners' Association. Price 3d.

THIS short Report of a visit to the Soviet coalmines last November is of great interest and value. It gives in a remarkably clear and simple way the answers to those questions that are being repeatedly asked by men in British pits regarding the wages, working and living conditions of Soviet miners.

The Delegation consisted of seven Durham miners, all of whom had long experience as workmen in the pits, and also as active officials and workers in the Trade Union and Labour movement. They stress the fact that they had absolute freedom to do and to see what they wanted, and also that they did not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hesitate either to praise or to criticise: "We were pitmen among pitmen; and we found that plain speaking, providing it was based on a balanced judgment, was greatly appreciated."

It is still possible to hear people talk glibly of Russia as "of course, a backward country," but every page of this Report describes conditions that are far ahead of what we have in this country.

The Delegation strongly criticises the employment of women in the mines, even though the women work on light jobs, but it gives generous praise to the regulation prohibiting any boy below the age of 18 years from working underground. The men are paid a standard wage for a "norm" of output, which, the Delegation say, is so low that a British miner could fulfil it three or four times a shift. Each and every ton produced above the "norm" is paid for, not as we would all expect here, at a gradually decreasing rate, but at a rate of pay that increases steadily for every extra ton filled.

The Delegation paid strict attention to such questions as ventilation and timber, and describe how the men have their own full time inspectors, in addition to the Government mines inspectors, and the local inspectors at each pit. The full time inspectors have power to enforce their decisions, and reports of their visits have to be posted up at the pitheads. Shot-firing is the cause of many accidents in this country, but the Delegation declares that if shots were fired here under the same restrictive conditions as in Soviet mines "it would be problematical whether we could secure half our present output."

A month's holiday each year with full pay, a six-hour day bank to bank for face workers, compensation at the rate of two-thirds for twenty days and then full wages, a pension at 50 years of age equal to 60 per cent. of his wages (still paid even if the miner continues to work) supplies of coal to married and single miners, adequate services of doctors and nurses at the pits, and very efficient rescue brigades—all these are described in a simple and authoritative fashion.

A special part of the Report deals with the *Stakanovite* movement. Here the Delegation go to some pains to show how it operates, and to destroy some of the bogies spread regarding it, as being just a new form of pace-breaking and harder work.

"We think our people are working harder than the Stakanovites, and under less favourable conditions of labour," says the Delegation, which defines the movement as the method by which "efficiency and skill are combined to secure the highest productivity with the minimum of energy," and as being "a necessary stepping stone on the way to complete Socialism."

Miners and miners' branches in every part of the British coalfield should make a special point of obtaining and studying this very useful Report.

WILLIAM ALLAN,
(*Chairman, Cambois Branch, Northumberland Miners' Association.*)

ART AND SOCIETY.

Art and Society. By George V. Plekhanov. Critics Group Reprint. New York. 1936.

PLEKHANOV'S essays, *Art and Society*, written in 1913, and *French Drama and Painting of the Eighteenth Century* (1905) belong to the classics of marxist criticism. Their re-issue in a handy booklet is particularly welcome to-day.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Plekhanov's subject in the former essay is the theory of " art for art's sake." It was his purpose to demonstrate under what social conditions such a conception of art could arise and to trace its changing significance during the period of its sway. Starting with the later work of Pushkin and with the early nineteenth century French romantics, Plekhanov examines the reasons that induced these artists to turn away in disgust from the " vulgar mob," reject the age-old claim that art should serve a useful social function, and worship at the shrine of " pure æsthetic form."

The most important point established by Plekhanov for this early phase is the fact that the " mob " which disgusted the artist was *not* the working class or peasantry, but his own class, the bourgeoisie. Consequently, the conception of social utility which the early upholders of art for art's sake could not but reject was its specifically bourgeois form : cash value, capitalist profitability. But since they shared the common bourgeois illusion that this specific, historical form was the only possible form of social utility, they rejected, together with it, the entire claim that art should serve a social purpose. Disgusted with the vulgar sordidness of the bourgeois scramble for profits they revolted against the *forms* of bourgeois life without, however, desiring to remove the capitalist basis of that life. This applies, according to Plekhanov, not only to the romantics, but also to the early realists. Although in their work they provided a striking exposure of bourgeois society, they were nevertheless unable to recognise in the working class the force able to transform that society. Thus Plekhanov concludes that " the tendency of artists and those concerned with art to adopt an attitude of art for art's sake arises when a hopeless contradiction exists between them and their social environment."

The weakness of this formulation is its generalising, insufficiently historical, character. For the peculiar contradiction between the artists and not merely their general social environment, but in particular their patrons, and the theory of art for art's sake which expressed this contradiction, are the symptoms of a specific historical stage in the development of capitalism. After the political victory of the bourgeoisie, bourgeois social relations were revealed in all their sordid brutality. But the great historical mission of capitalism, the mission of raising the productivity of human labour, had still to be fulfilled. In spite of its renewed and even more brutal rôle as exploiters the bourgeoisie was still a progressive class. Because Plekhanov neglected this specific historical situation he did not, in my opinion, sufficiently stress the really progressive elements in the work of the early romantics and realists.

The progressive conquest of nature by the mechanical materialists and the dialectical conception of history developed by the great idealists were the highest ideological achievements of bourgeois thought. The artistic representatives of the great idealists, especially the English romantics or Balzac, the greatest of the French realists, never rejected the social view of art. On the other hand the essential achievement of the most progressive among the upholders of art for art's sake was an ever more consistent naturalism (expressed most clearly in the line of painters from Géricault to Courbet).

Just as the technical revolution of that period, though increasing exploitation a thousandfold, yet provided the only basis for the final abolition of exploitation, so the most progressive artists, though escaping from the sordid social relations of their time into the sphere of artistic form, could not but embody the progressive substance of a still advancing capitalism in their work. And because they did so, they were able, when the bourgeoisie ceased to be progressive and when in the Paris Commune the workers created the first prototype of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society of the future, to identify themselves wholeheartedly, as did Courbet, with the class that was now the vanguard of social progress.

This perspective enables us to understand the change in the significance of art for art's sake during the age of imperialism which Plekhanov describes in such brilliant detail. It was then that the theory attained its culmination, but that culmination was at the same time its negation. Once the stage was set for the final struggle for power between a declining bourgeoisie and the rising working class, the theory of art for art's sake could only be maintained by a violent break with realism, or even with naturalism, in any shape or form. Realism in literature was replaced by a mystical sensualism. The development of painting proceeded through the subjective naturalism of the impressionists to the absolute subjectivism of the twentieth century cubists and expressionists. But, as Plekhanov shows, this subjectivism, though the extreme manifestation of art for art's sake, was at the same time a violent, programmatic assertion of idealism. And this idealism was essentially, and to an ever increasing extent also consciously, a defence of capitalism against the working class (e.g.,Hamsun, and, we may add, the proto-fascist Futurists). Plekhanov thus concludes his essay : " the ruling class is now in such a position that to go forward can only mean to go downward, and this sad fate is shared by all their ideologists as well. The foremost among them are those who have sunk lower than all their predecessors."

Again we must ask whether this conclusion, so essentially true from the wider perspective of socialist realism, is sufficiently exhaustive to serve as our guide in our immediate task of welding the united front on the basis of all the progressive elements and feelings still to be found in many bourgeois artists to-day. Later developments have shown that Plekhanov's judgment, though true in general, was yet not the whole truth. For, in spite of their idealism, the final escape into form of the twentieth century formalists still retained a progressive element : the attempt to refashion the technique of artistic communication on the basis of modern science. Even in the age of imperialism scientific and technical advance continues, although the use to which it is put and the conditions under which it proceeds are in ever more violent conflict with its true content. Just as the true scientist or technician is outraged when the fruits of his labours, instead of increasing the welfare of mankind, are used for its further degradation, so the artist who perfects the means of artistic communication cannot fail to be disgusted by a class which only values him as a useful aid for the sale of patent medicines. Their integrity as creative workers drives both to break with their exploiters and to reclaim their true function and the true content of their work by joining the struggle for a new society.

Under the impact of the War and of the armed struggle for power between labour and capital which followed it, the subjective idealism which hitherto prevented the adoption by the artists of a new, progressive, social content experienced its first crisis in the Dadaish breakdown. The epic development of Russian art from the first great silent films onwards is the history of the new union of form and content in socialist realism. But in the western countries subjective idealism, though shaken, was not wholly undermined. It re-emerged during the period of relative stabilisation even in such professedly revolutionary movements as Surrealism. To-day, the false idealism of modern art which fetters it to capitalism is even more in conflict with the irrepressible urge of the true artist for creative integrity than in the immediate pre-war years. But to-day the political issues facing the world are too brutally clear

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to enable the artist still to hesitate which side he shall take. To-day, the artist, the writer, the scientist, whose work is more to him than the bread and jam of slavery, joins the worker in a united struggle for the right to create.

Less urgent in its immediate topicality, though equally important as a masterpiece of marxist art history, is Plekhanov's earlier essay on *French Drama and Painting of the Eighteenth Century*. Its theme—in a sense the direct opposite of that of the essay just discussed—is the active rôle of drama and painting in the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the ancient régime preceding and during the great French Revolution. With the wealth of detail drawn both from original sources and the latest available work of the specialist which makes all Plekhanov's historical studies so valuable for us to-day he traces the change in style that marks his period to the basic changes in its class structure and to the struggles in which those changes were achieved. The central problem of Plekhanov's analysis is that of classicism. In his view it is essentially the artistic form of absolutism, while the sentimental drama and painting of the second half of the century embodies the growing struggle of the bourgeoisie for emancipation. Yet Plekhanov is puzzled to find that as soon as the fight between absolutism and the Third Estate reaches its final stage, the protagonists of the new order adopt the " reactionary " form of classicism for their propaganda art. Plekhanov rightly stresses that the sentimental form could not provide the manly vigour required for the revolutionary struggle, and that, moreover, the basic content of classicism as now used has changed from its old function of glorifying absolutism. There are, in fact, two entirely different and directly opposed meanings of classicism, the one embodying all the respect for rule, ceremonial and social rank of the absolute monarchy, the other the vigorous struggle for emancipation of the middle class.

By defining this dualism in the style of classicism Plekhanov was able with the tool of marxist analysis to go far beyond the achievements of formal bourgeois art analysis, dominant until long after the date of this essay. But he was wrong in regarding the absolutist form of classicism as primary and the bourgeois form consequently as reactionary In fact the reverse is the case. For classical art arose as the ideological embodiment of the Greek city republic after the victory of the free artisans and peasants over the proto-feudal landlords of the previous age (see Engels' brilliant summary of " The Origin of the Family "). It embodied, together with the liberal aspirations, all the rationalist elements in the outlook of the new city middle class before the basis of either was transformed by the emergence of large-scale production founded on slavery and colonial exploitation. It was the latter change that also transformed the essence of classical art and produced the new spirit of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The libertarian element was replaced by a spirit of authority, reason by rule, creative harmony by academic correctness. And the same sequence was repeated in every classicistic revival since the high middle ages. The artistic expression of every bourgeois revolt against feudalism derived inspiration and vigour from the classical elements in ancient art, while in every subsequent reaction these same elements became codified and academic and served to reinforce the authority of absolutism. Even in the 17th century France classicism did not arise in the first place as the style of absolutism as such, but as that of a progressive administration (Richelieu) attempting with the help of the rising bourgeoisie to unify and consolidate the nation against the resistance of the feudal lords. Only after the monarchy had turned against the bourgeoisie (Revocation of the Edict of Nantes) and had attempted to establish its power on the basis of the now subservient court nobility, did French 17th century classicism assume the academic, authoritarian character

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

described by Plekhanov. Since, moreover, the basis of absolutism and of its rationalised state regulation of every sphere of life is the essentially irrational claim of Divine Right, it invariably came into conflict with the rational elements of classicism and finally tended to abandon that style almost entirely for the sensualistic splendour of the baroque. And it is this latter style, rather than the theoretical academism, which in its later development of the roccoco decided the character of absolutist art in its eighteenth century decline. When, therefore, David and the artists of the French Revolution went back to Poussin and Corneille (whose plays provided the themes for some of their most revolutionary paintings) in their effort to create the form adequate for their revolutionary content, they were not taking a reactionary course ; they were, in fact, drawing the strength for their own struggle from the art that gave expression to every revolutionary struggle of the bourgeoisie since its first appearance.

The dualism of classicism is symbolically expressed in the story of Brutus. Every republican phase since the early renaissance saw its hero in the man who saved the republic by smiting the usurper. Every absolute monarch (or renaissance " tyrant ") saw in him the regicide and traitor and at the same time glorified his own position by assuming the title of Cæsar.

F. D. KLINGENDER.

HEROISM VICTORIOUS.

Defence of Madrid. By Geoffrey Cox, *News Chronicle* Correspondent in Madrid. (Victor Gollancz.) 2s. 6d. (Left Book Club, 1s. 3d.)

OCTOBER-November-December, 1936, black days for the people of Spain, days of anguish and sorrow. A sorrow shared by the democrats of the world, who too often put their anxious query, " How long before Madrid falls ? "

Now the Fascists are at the gates of Madrid. Well trained and disciplined Moorish mercenaries, Italian and German regular army troops, all armed with the most modern and deadly instruments of destruction, flushed with comparatively easy successes in their invading march across Spain. Who are opposed to this army ? Men and women without military training, knowledge or experience of modern warfare ; men and women unarmed but prepared to fight with pitchforks, knives, lumps of wood or bare hands, the more fortunate armed with rifles dated 1870-1890, which looked like lengths of gas piping mounted on bits of wood.

" I will take coffee in the Puerto del Sol (in the centre of Madrid) on October 31," boasted Fascist General Mola.

But the first heroes of world democracy, the volunteers of the International Brigade, arrived in Madrid to play their part in defeating the scourge of humanity. Madrid did not fall ! The Fascist advance was halted.

How did this miracle happen ? This book briefly, but very graphically, supplies the answer ; reading it one sees and feels what was happening in Madrid in those fateful days. Geoffrey Cox brings the Fascist rebellion right on to our doorsteps and makes us feel ashamed of the part played by the National Government, by the Bevins and the Citrines.

" ' What sort of a man is Plymouth ? ' " " ' Plymouth ? ' " I queried. " ' Yes, the head of your Non Intervention Committee. Has he any feeling for Spain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or is he, too, going to stand by, letting Italy and Germany try to conquer us? And your Labour leaders? They have money enough. Why don't they try to get us arms! (Why Sir Walter?) Aren't there any democrats left in England?'"

"A cloud of dust and smoke filled the end of a little street of the Gran Via . . . Suddenly from inside the house a woman's shriek rose above the clamour. It mingled with another scream overhead. With a tearing crash, as if a railway engine had come full tilt through the air, a shell hit a building fifty yards up the street . . . ."

The Militiawoman: "'Why am I here?'" she said. "'Because I hate Fascism and believe it should be fought. Besides, my husband is here in this regiment. We were never apart in peace time, why should I leave him in war?'"

So one could go on making scores of quotations from this fine book, describing events which will live gloriously in the history of the international working class.

Our best thanks to Geoffrey Cox for showing us even only a little of the vast resources of courage and heroism and sacrifice that is displayed by our class when it fights for its ideal—the freedom of mankind.

JULIUS JACOBS.

Eugene Pottier et "l'Internationale." By Alexandre Zevaes. (Editions Sociales Internationales.)

FRANCISQUE SARCEY, one time literary critic of the well known French paper, the *Temps*, round about '86, went around the circles in which he moved in Paris asking everyone he met: "Have you read Eugene Pottier, or at least do you know him by name?" He goes on to say:

> And I found no one who knew Eugene Pottier, no one who had ever read a word of Eugene Pottier. Pottier is still more unknown than Baruch, who at least was a little prophet. This poor Pottier has unfortunately not belied the proverb which says "that one is never a prophet in his own country."

Yet if one was to put the same question as did the reactionary critic to most of the people one meets even in the working-class movement of this country to-day, I am afraid one would not meet with much more luck than he did.

True, we in Britain have not been given the opportunity of appreciating the works of Eugene Pottier. The hymn of his that we all know (though many may not know the name of the author) is badly translated and inharmoniously adapted to the music. Pottier, member of the Paris Commune and author of the *Internationale*, wrote these six verses, which in the 20th century were to be sung throughout the world, in the days immediately following the fall of the Paris Commune, when he was in hiding in Paris.

"It is by no means," writes Zevaes, "from the purely literary point of view, the best song of Pottier. But the *Internationale* has this characteristic and advantage that from a propaganda point of view it condenses into six verses the essential conceptions of the Socialist proletariat."

In its original (and even in the English) version it criticises the capitalist State, it decries the robbing of the workers by the bosses, it proclaims the emancipation of the workers as the task of the workers themselves. But the English version does not bring out clearly the anti-war lead contained in the fifth verse, and, still more important, it does not bring out the International (the First International—the International Workingmen's Association, to which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it refers) as the class organisation of the toilers, as a comparison of the first two lines of the sixth verse will show :

English version :

Ye peasants, artisans and others
Enrolled amongst the sons of toil.

French text, with free translation in brackets :

Ouvriers, paysans, nous sommes
(Workers, peasants, we are)
Le grand Parti des travailleurs . . .
(The great Party of the toilers).

Nor again does the English version of the first verse bring out with clarity the dawn of the new society in which the " slaves " will be all powerful.

Pottier, who wrote the hymn of the international working-class, was himself a worker, a revolutionary who proudly proclaimed in his poem, *l'Insurge*, that " the insurgents' true name is Man ! " At the age of 13 he started work as a packer, but after a few years he left this job which he didn't like, to become a designer on cloth. Yet even this work did not keep his mind occupied, and while his hands worked his mind was busy composing songs and poems.

But Pottier was not satisfied with simply writing against the bourgeoisie in verse, from his youth he participated in the struggles of the workers. After fighting in the streets of Paris in June, 1848, in his poem, *Qui la vengera*, he shouted his hope of new and successful struggles. Even under the Third Empire before the right of association was won, he formed a trade union in his trade, which affiliated to the First International. Pottier was one of the leading members of the French section of the First International which signed the appeal to the German people against war in July, 1870. Then came the Commune. Pottier was still in the forefront of the revolutionary struggle and, on April 16, 1871, was elected a member of the first workers' government, the Paris Commune. With the rest of the Paris workers he resisted the Versaillaise and fought on the barricades. Later he was to write his famous poem, *Elle n'est pas morte*, in which he declared that despite the fact that they had shot it down with machine-guns, " soon they would feel . . . that the Commune is not dead ! "

After living in exile, in this country and in the U.S.A., he returned to France in 1880 and continued to contribute to Socialist papers ; he was a supporter of Jules Guesde and of the Marxist Paul Lafargue. Pottier's works were published in two volumes, *Quel est le fou, le monde ou moi ?* " (Who is mad, the world or I ?), and *Chants Revolutionnaires* (Revolutionary Songs).

There is, besides Pottier, another name which will always be bound to his with the *Internationale*, that of Pierre Degeyter, who wrote the music of the hymn of the international working-class. Zevaes in his pamphlet also gives us a brief outline of his life.

Degeyter was a textile worker living in Lille and belonging to the Socialist choir. In 1888 the choir was searching for more revolutionary songs and looking through Pottier's work found the *Internationale* which Degeyter was asked to put to music. For a number of years its reputation was merely local, and it was not until 1896 that it began to spread throughout France ; in 1900 it was sung for the first time at an International Congress in Paris ; it was more or less adopted as the hymn of the Second International in Copenhagen in 1910, when it was sung at the close of the Congress.

This year will mark the 50th anniversary of the death of Pottier (died 6 November, 1887), and the 5th anniversary of the death of Pierre Degeyter (died 26 September, 1932).

WILLIAM ZAK.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

What is Ahead of Us? G. D. H. Cole and others. (Allen and Unwin.) 5s. 192 pp.

The Other Man's Job. E. P. Leigh Bennett. (Allen and Unwin.) 10s. 6d. 281 pp.

Social Justice First. C. V. Brayne. (Allen and Unwin.) 3s. 6d. 100 pp.

Readings in Leninism: What is Leninism? (No. 1) 124 pp.; *The Theory of Proletarian Revolution* (No. 2), 155 pp.; *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (No. 3), 122 pp.; *Strategy and Tactics* (No. 4), 96 pp. 2s. each. (Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.)

Catholicisme et Communisme. Robert Honnert. *Editions Sociales Internationales.* 10f. 160 pp.

Concerning the Historic Importance of Edward Livingstone. Mitchell Franklin. Tulane Law Review, New Orleans, Louis. 212 pp.

The Condition of Britain. G. D. H. and M. I. Cole. (Gollancz.) 7s. 6d. 471 pp.

Man's Worldly Goods. Leo Huberman. (Gollancz.) 10s. 6d. 356 pp.

The Prevention of Future Crises in the World System. Robert Bosch. (Constable.) 1s. 6d. 39 pp.

Phineas Kahn. Portrait of an Immigrant. Simon Blumenfeld. (Jonathan Cape.) 7s. 6d. 378 pp.

War in Spain. F. White. (Longmans.) 1s. 6d. 85 pp.

Death from the Skies. A Study of Gas and Microbial Warfare. Heinz Liepman. (Martin Secker and Warburg.) 6s. 280 pp.

Mr. Witt Among the Rebels. Ramon J. Sender. (Faber and Faber.) 7s. 6d. 367 pp.

The Russian Peasant Movement, 1906-1917. Launcelot A. Owen. (P. S. King and Son.) 12s. 6d. 267 pp.

World Revolution, 1917-1936. The Rise and Fall of the Communist International. C. L. R. James. (Martin Secker and Warburg.) 12s. 6d. 429 pp.

What Science Stands For. Prof. Hogben, Sir John Boyd Orr, and others. (Allen and Unwin.) 5s. 132 pp.

The Science of Social Adjustment. Sir Josiah Stamp. (MacMillan.) 7s. 6d. 174 pp.

The Second Five Year Plan, 1933-1937. State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R. (Lawrence and Wishart.) 8s. 6d. 671 pp.

The Road to War—by a group of writers. Preface by C. R. Attlee, M.P. (Gollancz.) 3s. 6d. net. 207 pp.

Pamphlets: *The New Economic Revolution.* Margaret Cole. (Fact Publishing Co.). 6d. 98 pp. *Labour's Immediate Programme.* (Labour Party Publications,). 1d. 8 pp. *Does Co-operation Want Youth?* (British Federation of Co-operative Youth.) 2d. 19 pp. *Spain Calling.* Pierre Robert. (International Publishing Co.). 2d. 24 pp.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Students Start Fund for *Labour Monthly*

Oxford & Cambridge Have a Plan . . . .

THE LABOUR MONTHLY has very often been encouraged by the appreciation of its work that has been expressed by university students. But this month we have something even better to record.

A plan has been invented by two groups of undergraduates, members of the Oxford University Labour Club and of the Cambridge University Socialist Club. It is simply that of a *collective guarantee.*

The first aim is to get a definite sum each month for the LABOUR MONTHLY Guarantee Fund from each group, to be raised by regular contributions, from 1d. a week upwards, organised among fellow students.

Oxford has already started off with the splendid contribution of £5 6s. 6d., recorded in our Fund this month.

The collector for Oxford is: Philip Toynbee, Christchurch, Oxford.

The collector for Cambridge is: Bernard Knox, 5 All Saints' Passage, Cambridge.

The final aim set is to keep the LABOUR MONTHLY clear of debt altogether, which would make wider developments of our journal possible.

The LABOUR MONTHLY greatly hopes that the idea of the collective guarantee will be taken up by student groups in the other Universities, so that in this way a chain of collective guarantors may come into being throughout the country.

Hearty thanks to Oxford and Cambridge for the plan they have initiated and to Oxford for the fine May-Day gift with which it has been launched.

We are hoping for more good news next month.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEBT FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	148	11	5½
B.C., Canada	0	2	2
S. Hughes, Capel Curig	0	3	0
Sheffield Study Course ..	0	10	0
M. Epstein, Northwold, Suffolk	0	2	1½
Anon., Prescott	1	0	0
Carried Forward	£150	8	9

	£	s.	d.
Brought Forward	150	8	9
Sales Profits, per F.W.B.	0	8	0
J. G. Burki, Alberta, Canada	0	4	0
A. H. Turner, Manchester	0	3	0
M.P., Vancouver ..	1	0	0
Oxford Students ..	5	6	6
Mrs. Joan Findlay, Pretoria	1	0	0
	£158	10	3

GUARANTEE FUND

(Amount of Monthly Guarantee.)

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged	19	7	1
Edinburgh Reader	0	0	6
	£19	7	7

To the Manager, THE LABOUR MONTHLY, 7 John Street, London, W.C.1.

**In response to your appeal I enclose herewith the sum of* ..... *as a contribution to the* LABOUR MONTHLY *Debt Fund.*

**I promise to send the sum of* .....*monthly to the Guarantee Fund until further notice and enclose a first instalment of* .....

**Strike out whichever sentence does not apply.*

Name .....

Address .....

Date .....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ADVERTISE EVERYWHERE!

Unity Meetings, Spain Campaign Meetings, etc., etc. Advertise the journal which has been right in the front in promoting Unity in Britain—

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

Ask for free display and publicity materials describing the purpose for which they are required.

Write us at : 7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.

BOUND VOLUMES

FOR 1936

In Exchange for the 12 issues of your LABOUR MONTHLY you can get for **4/6** a bound volume post free

Ordinary Price - - - - **10/6**

ORDER IMMEDIATELY

From

The Manager, 7 John Street, Theobald's Road, London, W.C.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every member of our staff has a personal interest in YOUR job.....

that is the effect of Co-partnership and naturally it reflects in the quality of the work.

Every man takes a personal pride in the job he is doing because it is the reputation of his House which is at stake and he knows that he will share the rewards of a job well done.

The staff of the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society is welded together by common interests as Shareholders of the Society. Social organisation and education create an atmosphere of contentment and unity in which the craftsman can give of his best.

That is why L.C.P.S. Print is finer and L.C.P.S. Service is better. You can easily prove it!

FINE PRINT BY EVERY PROCESS

Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Ltd.,

99 CHURCH GATE, LEICESTER. Telephone 56204

Branches at London and Kettering

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED